



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24, 2013

No. 57

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

April 24, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RODNEY L. DAVIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

BORDER NEVER SECURED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Senate immigration bill never secures the border. It plans to mostly secure the "high-risk sectors," which are less than half the border. And there is no guarantee that this will happen since there are no deadlines.

In fact, if the high-risk sectors are not secured after 5 years, a commission is established to make recommendations. "Make recommendations" sure doesn't sound like a secure border to me.

And there is the entry-exit system to deter those who overstay their visas—about 40 percent of all illegal immigrants. But it only applies to airports and seaports, not land checkpoints where most of the crossings occur. Again, there are no deadlines.

So it's amnesty for millions in 6 months and border security later, if ever.

IN MEMORY OF THOSE LOST IN THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say the following in Armenian to my Armenian friends:

Sireli hai paraganneres, hos yev ashkharee chors goghmereh. Aysor, Haiots Tseghasbahnootian inisoonoot erort daretitseen oreh, khoskes googhem tsezi Neriguyatsusichneroo Don ambiyonen, tser medzhahreh loon lezvov.

Lezoo muh vorov anonk gardahaideyeen irents hooyserreh, gyankheh, yeraznerreh, yev sereh hazar inuh hairoor dasnuhinkee naxortogh darineron.

Osmanyen Guysrutian daradzkin, dasnyag hazaravorner chartehvetsan.

Tsezi guh khoseem lezvovuh ayn yerexaneroon voronk aganadess yeghan irents hayreru spanootyan.

Hazaravor geener pernaparvetsan.

Tsezi guh khoseem lezvovuh anonks toosdreroon, voronk koot gugherseyeen toork vosdiganneren.

Tsezi guh khoseem lezvovuh ayn yerekhaneroon, voronk gateel muh choor gugherseyeen.

Tsezi guh khoseem lezvovuh ayn myreroon, voronk mahatsahn irents noradzeenneruh irents keegeroon mech.

Tsezi guh khoseem lezvovuh ayn verabroghneroon, voronk Amereega yegan azadootyooneth vaylelu yev nor gyank muh usguselloo hamar.

Kuhreteh meg tareh eever, toorkia goorana tsaghasbanootyooneh. Toorkiah goozech, vor ashkharuh morna ays maseen.

Tsezi guh khoseem lezvovuh anonks, voronk ayleves chegan. Anonk mezmeh guh khentren heeshell zeerenk. Anonks tsaynereh dagaveen guh lesveen.

Yes ays nahadagneren voyeveh megoon hednortuh chem, sagayn tsezi guh khoseem irents keghetseez lezvov, vorovhedeve aysor, polores hai enk!

Tsezi guh khoseem ays vayren, Nerguyatsutsichneroo Don ambiyonen vorovhedeve Amerigatsi joghovurteh meeshd jagaden yez kachootyamp nayadz eh polor sarsapneroon oo zanonk gochadz eh irents poon anoonov.

Guh sbasem ayn orvan, yerp ir ghegavarnereh yeves nooynuh beedee unnen. Vorovhedeve yes vuhsdah em, vor ayt oruh beedee kah. Guh sbasem vor chooshanah, vorbesi verabroghneruh luhsen anor tsentseech tsignuh.

Asdvadz mer tsignuh luhseh.

(English translation of the above statement is as follows:)

To my Armenian friends: Today, on the 98th anniversary of the genocide day, I speak to you in the language of your grandparents and your great grandparents—the language they used to speak of their hopes, their dreams, their loves in the years before 1915.

By the time it was over in 1923, more than 1.5 million Armenians—men, women and children—were dead. It was the first genocide of the 20th Century.

I speak to you in the language of the mothers who died with their babies in their arms.

Throughout the Ottoman Empire, tens of thousands were killed outright. Others were force marched through desert heat as the Ottoman government sought to destroy a people.

I speak to you in the language of the children begging for a drop of water.

Women were raped by the thousands.

I speak to you in the language of the girls begging the gendarmes for mercy.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2251

A nation was scattered around the world. To the Middle East, to Europe and to America.

I speak to you in the language of the survivors who came to America for freedom and made a new life.

For almost a century, Turkey has denied the genocide. In the face of overwhelming evidence—much of it from American diplomats and journalists—Ankara has denied that the genocide ever happened. They want the world to forget.

I speak to you in the language of those who were lost. Their voices drift across the decades—begging us to not forget them, no matter how hard some people try.

I am not Armenian, but I speak to you in your language because on this day we are all Armenian. For many years I have sat with you and listened—to the stories of those who were lost in the genocide and those who survived.

I speak to you in their language and yours to thank you for sharing your history with me and to pledge again that I will not stop fighting until the United States lives up to its principles by honoring and commemorating the Armenian Genocide.

And because I know that day will come. May it come soon, so the last of the survivors may hear its awesome sound.

May God hear our voices.

PENN STATE UNIVERSITY 11TH ANNUAL EQUINE SCIENCE SHOWCASE AND QUARTER HORSE SALE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this coming weekend, I will have the opportunity and the honor to attend Penn State University's 11th Annual Equine Science Showcase and Quarter Horse Sale.

As a land-grant university, horses of various breeds have always been a part of Penn State's Department of Dairy and Animal Science. As machinery replaced the draft horse, Penn State started the move towards the lighter horse types. Today, PSU focuses on the quarter horse for its diverse abilities, from working stock to show and recreation. Quarter horses are estimated to generate more than \$10.5 billion in economic output nationally.

This Saturday, 21 quarter horses will go on the auction block at Penn State's popular Equine Science Showcase and Quarter Horse Sale. The auction has grown with support from students and people in the equine industry, from 70 in the first auction to almost 500 last year.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the 2013 sale's participating Penn State students, student co-managers Jordy Hudson and Melissa Wise, and instructor of equine sciences and horse farm coordinator Brian Egan.

SEQUESTRATION'S EFFECTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, 7 weeks on, Americans have already begun to feel the effects of the Republican policy of sequestration.

Sequestration defies common sense and is irresponsible. It is happening because the Tea Party faction of the Republican Party is hell-bent on cutting spending, no matter what the consequences, no matter how irrationally it is done, and no matter how adverse the consequences of these cuts.

These arbitrary, across-the-board cuts to Federal programs without regard to our priorities was never meant to be a solution, but rather, a deterrent to Congress failing to reach one.

□ 1010

Since coming into effect on March 1, Americans are seeing why sequestration is not a policy we should follow or continue. This week, the FAA began furloughs for 47,000 employees. I've talked to the Secretary and I've talked to the Deputy Assistant Secretary. They do not have an option under the policies that this Congress has adopted. Thirteen thousand air traffic controllers are among those 47,000.

Already, delays of up to 2 hours at major airports are disrupting travel, which impacts business and produces major headaches for American families trying to get to where they need to go. Some flights have been diverted because the air traffic control system is being overwhelmed with limited personnel.

In addition to its effects on the FAA, sequestration is also placing a heavy burden on small business. According to an article in Politico on April 16—just a few days ago—small businesses are being hit the hardest by sequestration's cuts. The Small Business Administration is being forced to cut \$16.7 million in loan subsidies; those are guarantees. That means \$16.7 million in loans—capital—not available to small businesses. At the same time, the article goes on to report as many as 956,000 small business jobs could be at risk from sequestration as employers lay off their workers in anticipation of further cuts.

We ought to abandon this stupid policy.

Also at stake are critical research programs in medicine and science research that fuel American innovation and advance lifesaving treatments. They're at risk because of sequestration. Cuts to the National Institutes of Health are already leading to a reduction in research grants, including tens of millions of dollars that will halt innovative genomics and cancer research at some of America's top universities, including Harvard, Penn, and Johns Hopkins in my State. And the National Science Foundation will have to award 1,000 fewer grants this year to researchers who are helping keep America on top of technology and innovation. How irrational.

This is a stupid, harmful, future-hurting, and America-undercutting policy. It must be changed.

Sequestration is also reducing our military readiness and putting civilian defense employees at risk of being furloughed and, more to the point, putting at risk our own national security. Communities in my district across Maryland and throughout the country whose economies depend on a strong military are going to be hard hit.

But the good news is there is an alternative. Congress has the power to end sequestration by reaching a big and balanced solution to deficits that can replace these irrational cuts. But to do so, Democrats and Republicans will have to work together in a bipartisan way. We ought to go to conference on the budget, adopt a fiscally responsible and balanced plan, and eliminate the sequester for this year and the 8 years to come.

We offered an alternative to sequester four times in the last month, and four times we were not given the opportunity to have it voted upon on this floor. This was supposed to be open and transparent, and we would consider alternatives. We did not. But I believe we can do it. Our economy, our ability to create jobs, and the success of our country in the decade ahead is dependent on our jettisoning these irrational cuts we call sequestration.

Too many jobs, lives, and livelihoods are at stake for Congress to engage in partisan games. As the weeks and months continue without turning sequestration off, its effects will only get worse.

Let's act now. Let's act together. Let's act in a bipartisan way before our people and our businesses feel the full effects of this irrational and senseless sequestration policy. Let's work together to achieve the big, balanced solution the American people deserve from their Congress and that we owe to our country.

I will submit an article for the RECORD written by our colleague, Representative DAVID PRICE of North Carolina, entitled: "Lawmakers' sequestration double-talk."

[From the Charlotte Observer, Apr. 23, 2013]

LAWMAKERS' SEQUESTRATION DOUBLE-TALK

(By U.S. Rep. David E. Price)

Double-talk is never in short supply in Washington. But as the axe of "sequestration"—the across-the-board spending cuts triggered by Congress' failure to pass a long-term budget plan—begins to fall, self-contradiction and hypocrisy have reached heights unusual even for the Capitol.

Indeed, many of the same Congress members who welcomed sequestration as a way to force the president to cut spending are now protesting loudly when their pet programs feel the pain. Members who voted for the package that Speaker John Boehner said included "90 percent" of what Republicans wanted now claim that sequestration does not need to hurt very much and accuse the president of imposing cuts for political effect.

The reality is that sequestration was designed to cut both deeply and indiscriminately. Although it barely touches the two main deficit drivers—tax expenditures and entitlement spending—it was supposed to be sufficiently draconian and unacceptable to

force action on those fronts, to compel agreement on a comprehensive budget plan along the lines of the 2010 Bowles-Simpson Commission proposal or the budget agreements that produced four years of surpluses under President Bill Clinton.

Congress failed to produce such a plan, however, because Republicans refused to consider increasing revenues or closing special-interest loopholes. Today's Republicans value their anti-tax ideology far more than the defense cuts that were supposed to drive them to the bargaining table. As sequestration approached, more and more of them said, "Bring it on."

Now that the cuts are coming, members are scrambling, sometimes to apply Band-Aids, sometimes to insist that the president spare programs they favor. One day there is an outcry about reduced meat inspections, on another an insistence that tuition benefits for military personnel be restored, on another that air-traffic controllers be kept on duty in little-used airports. The latest uproar started two days ago. Federal Aviation Administration furloughs of air traffic controllers at large airports kicked in, delaying flights across the country—at Charlotte Douglas International Airport 31.2 percent of flights were delayed. My North Carolina colleague, Rep. Renee Ellmers, recently introduced a bill to reverse Medicare cuts for cancer treatment, calling the cuts an "unintended consequence" of sequestration. In fact, the 2 percent cuts were an intended and easily anticipated consequence of sequestration.

Congress has now passed appropriations bills for the remainder of 2013, locking in place the sequestration spending levels. Scattered provisions mitigate specific sequestration impacts, but the result often is to shift the cuts to equally important areas that aren't in the news at the moment. Fort Bragg, adjacent to my district, now faces a furlough of civilian employees and a 34 percent cut in its operating budget. And sequestration comes on top of \$1 trillion in cuts to domestic programs already adopted. Together, these cuts have driven major disease research off a cliff—fewer than 10 percent of proposals to fund heart disease, cancer and diabetes research are being funded—and slowed road and bridge construction to a snail's pace.

I want to mitigate the harm as much as any member of Congress. But damage control is not a viable budget policy. Sequestration is a self-inflicted wound, unworthy of those who profess to govern. It is hypocritical and misleading, having imposed indiscriminate cuts on the administration, to pretend that the president can fix the problems with a flick of the wrist.

The remedy lies in a comprehensive budget agreement that puts revenues and all categories of spending on the table. The president's budget reflects such an approach, going beyond the comfort zone of many of his political allies. A similar offer was spurned by Speaker Boehner and House Republicans in December, and sequestration ensued. It is a failure of historic proportions and it must be reversed.

BAY COUNTY CENTENNIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STOCKMAN). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the place that I am proud to call home, Bay County, Florida.

One hundred years ago today, Bay County was established by act of the

Florida Legislature, igniting a century of growth and opportunity for a close-knit community that still cherishes its rich history and traditions.

Bay County is located in the heart of northwest Florida, overlooking 41 miles of sugar-white sand beaches along the gulf coast's emerald green waters. With an additional 270 square miles occupied by pristine lakes, springs, streams, and the magnificent St. Andrews Bay, Bay County has become a national destination for tourists, families, fishermen, boaters, and water sports enthusiasts.

While Bay County's beaches and diverse inland areas attract over 8 million visitors each year, it is its people who live and work there that give this place a unique spirit. A small community of little more than 11,000 people in 1920, Bay County now embodies the drive of a diverse and growing population, totaling more than 170,000 people.

Bay County's workforce is among the best educated and most highly prepared in northwest Florida, with institutions of higher learning that rival any in the region. Its economic engine is fueled not by tourism alone, but also by thriving small businesses, nationally recognized companies, major manufacturers, and one of the newer airports in the United States. And, as the home of Tyndall Air Force Base, Naval Support Activity Panama City, and more than 22,000 veterans, Bay County enjoys a rich military history.

On this day, April 24, 2013, the day of Bay County's centennial, I am proud to join my friends, neighbors, my family, and local and county officials from Panama City, Panama City Beach, Lynn Haven, Springfield, Parker, Callaway, Mexico Beach, and the unincorporated areas of our county to celebrate our past and our bright future as we work hard to make Bay County a better place to live, work, and play.

SUDAN PEACE, SECURITY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, crimes by the Government of Sudan against its own people in Darfur were just beginning. The world witnessed the burning of villages, poisoning of water, murder, rape, brutal assault, and the deliberate forced displacement of entire villages by violence. In 2004, these acts were characterized by the U.S. Government and Congress as genocide.

For the past 6 years, the International Criminal Court has indicted and issued arrest warrants for Sudan's high officials, military commanders, and militia proxies for multiple counts of war crimes and crimes against humanity. In 2009 and 2010, President Omar al-Bashir himself was indicted by the ICC for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide.

International movements in support of the people of Darfur arose around the world, including a broad coalition here in the United States of religious, labor, peace, human rights, and student organizations calling for an end to the genocide in Darfur.

Between 2004 and 2007, Congress passed a series of bills limiting U.S. aid to Sudan and applying sanctions against Sudan for its atrocities in Darfur.

□ 1020

In 2007, I visited refugee camps in eastern Chad filled with hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children who had fled the violence in Darfur. Each has a personal story of horror and violence. While I was there, the janjaweed crossed the border and attacked two villages inside Chad, displacing thousands of people in the desolate landscape and brutal heat of Sahel in the dry season. I witnessed with admiration the emergency response mobilized within hours by U.N. and international humanitarian agencies and NGOs to provide these newly homeless and traumatized people with water, food, shelter, immunizations, and medical care.

I will never forget those people, those children. And I will never forget the caring of highly professional humanitarian aid workers who provided lifesaving support to these refugees under difficult and dangerous conditions.

Khartoum continues its brutal campaign in Darfur, and there is no end in sight. Eric Reeves, who 10 years ago bravely brought to the world some of the very first photo and video images of the scorched-earth campaign taking place in Darfur, continues to document ongoing atrocities in the region. The primary targets continue to be civilians from African tribal groups surviving tenuously in the chaotic region. Eric is now on the faculty of Smith College in Northampton, Massachusetts, and I am very proud to be his Representative in Congress.

Today, the violence and abuses of Darfur have expanded across Sudan. This February, the U.N. reported that over 1.5 million people have been displaced or severely affected because of the violence in Darfur, Abyei, South Kordofan, and Blue Nile, including some 90,000 to 100,000 people newly displaced in Darfur.

For over 3 years, the Sudanese Government has carried out aerial bombing and a scorched-earth campaign against civilians in the states of South Kordofan and Blue Nile under the pretext of battling armed insurgencies that operate in the area. The government continues to deny the World Food Programme and other humanitarian and religious organizations access to South Kordofan and Blue Nile to help the thousands in desperate need of food and basic care. The U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights has stated that abuses by the Government of Sudan in these States may constitute

war crimes and crimes against humanity.

Mr. Speaker, there comes a time when we have to say enough is enough. That is why Congressmen FRANK WOLF, MIKE CAPUANO, and I are reintroducing today the Sudan Peace, Security, and Accountability Act.

Khartoum's abuse of its own people is nationwide, and this bill focuses on Sudan as a whole. It requires a U.S. comprehensive strategy to end serious human rights violations in all of Sudan. It would provide genuine accountability for persons who have committed or assisted in serious human rights abuses. The bill supports the aspirations of the Sudanese people for peace and democratic reform. It encourages other governments and individuals to end support and aid to the Government of Sudan. And it reinvigorates genuinely comprehensive and sustainable peace efforts to end Sudan's multiple crises.

We must send a clear message to Khartoum that the time for change is now, that these abuses must stop, and that peace and genuine participation in the future of Sudan are rights that belong to all of the people of Sudan, no matter their race, ethnic or tribal background, religion, or political affiliation.

I urge all of my colleagues to join us on this legislation. It is past time to put an end to the pain, suffering, and genocide taking place in Sudan. It is time to support peace, security, and accountability.

SUDAN PEACE, SECURITY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2013

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION

Purpose: The "Sudan Peace, Security and Accountability Act of 2013" would create a comprehensive U.S. strategy to end serious human rights violations in Sudan, provide genuine accountability for persons who have committed or assisted in serious human rights violations, support Sudanese aspiration for democratic reforms, encourage other governments and persons to end support of and assistance to the government of Sudan, and to reinvigorate genuinely comprehensive and sustainable peace efforts that can end Sudan's multiple crises.

Background: 2013 marks ten years from the start of crimes in Darfur that the U.S. government found to constitute genocide. Previous legislation was passed to address the genocide in Darfur, but abuses have continued and expanded to other areas of Sudan. Aerial bombardment of civilian areas of South Kordofan and Blue Nile states and continued blocking of humanitarian relief by the Government of Sudan has led to over 900,000 Sudanese in need of humanitarian aid. Violence and aid restrictions also remain in Darfur where some 130,000 people have been newly displaced in the first months of 2013 alone. Reports by the UN and independent monitors have documented ongoing abuses by the Government of Sudan and those it supports that "may constitute war crimes and crimes against humanity".

HIGHLIGHTS OF LEGISLATION:

Requires the Administration and all relevant agencies to work together and create a comprehensive strategic plan to end serious human rights violations, provide genuine accountability for crimes committed in Darfur

and other parts of Sudan, support the path for democratic transformation, and create peace throughout all of Sudan;

Demands free and unfettered access for international humanitarian aid and, absent such agreement, requires the Administration to seek other mechanisms to mitigate the effects of lack of such humanitarian aid;

Promotes free and transparent democratic reform in Sudan, including exploring technical support and funding for civil society and others seeking sustainable democratic change;

Increases engagement with other stakeholders with influence in Sudan;

Creates a broad-reaching sanctions regime to target any government or individuals whose support assists the Sudanese government in committing serious human rights violations or who fail to execute international arrest warrants against Sudanese officials;

Seeks more effective enforcement of existing sanctions including adequate resources and personnel and extends to all of Sudan existing sanctions regimes included in prior enacted legislation that were specific only for "Darfur"; and

Provides genuine accountability for crimes committed in Darfur and encourages other countries to expand international accountability efforts to include crimes committed in other regions in Sudan.

[From Reuters, Apr. 12, 2013]

SOME 50,000 FLEE SUDAN INTO CHAD AFTER DARFUR CLASHES

N'DJAMENA.—Some 50,000 Sudanese have fled into southeastern Chad in the past week following fresh tribal conflict in the restive Darfur region, U.N. and Chadian officials said on Friday.

Melissa Fleming, a spokeswoman for the U.N. High Commission for Refugees, said the fighting had spread as each side received reinforcements from tribal allies and had become more violent, with entire villages being razed.

A total of 74,000 refugees had fled to Chad in the past two months, she said.

"People are arriving wounded and telling us their houses are destroyed and their villages completely burned down, with many people killed," she told a news conference in Geneva.

The refugees have fled to an arid area along the Chad, Sudan and Central African Republic border.

"The area they are arriving in is very remote. They left with nothing: there is no water, no food. They are sleeping under trees," Fleming said, adding there was a risk of disease.

General Moussa Haroun Tirgo, the governor of the Sila region of southeastern Chad where the refugees have fled, told Reuters that about 52 wounded had arrived since Thursday.

"The situation is worrying given that the zone does not have enough medical infrastructure," Tirgo said. "We're evaluating the needs with the help of NGOs but the situation is very serious."

Conflict has ravaged Sudan's western Darfur region since 2003 when mainly non-Arab rebels took up arms against the Arab-led government, accusing it of politically and economically marginalizing the region.

Violence has subsided from its peak in 2003 and 2004, but a surge has forced more than 130,000 people to flee their homes this year, according to the United Nations.

OUR NATION'S MISSILE DEFENSE ISN'T A BARGAINING CHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, once again, President Obama and his administration have offered up America's missile defense shield as a bargaining chip. Just the other week, Secretary of State John Kerry flew to China and offered to remove our recently added defenses in the Pacific to encourage them to counter the increasingly belligerent tone and actions by North Korea.

This is the same failed strategy that the administration offered up to the Russians in exchange for them engaging with Iran. If it failed to work then, how could it possibly work now?

At a time when our missile defense system is the only defense that we have to the threat from North Korea and the emerging threats from Iran, I am greatly concerned that our Nation's missile defense strategy is languishing. The end result is increased risk to the United States, increased cost to the taxpayer, and needless alienation of our allies.

Our enemies around the world have sought nuclear weapons and missile technology, yet the Obama administration has consistently reduced missile defense funding, abandoned previous Bush administration strategies that sought to respond to these emerging threats, and has compromised the implementation of current missile defense programs. Meanwhile, they have sought elusive Russian, and now Chinese, approval of the right of the United States to defend itself.

Most recently, the administration has abandoned its own missile defense strategy, known as the "phased adaptive approach," in favor of a stopgap measure of finally placing the additional ground-based missiles in Alaska that they had previously canceled. I welcome the administration finally completing the missile field which it has attempted to close. Although, this reveals that they have no plan to reasonably respond to the real and foreseeable threats from North Korea and Iran.

This announcement leaves the United States without an articulated missile defense strategy. This deficiency is compounded by the effects of the administration's clumsy handling of our relationship with our NATO allies. The abrupt cancellation of the Bush administration missile defense commitments, coupled with the announcement of the abandonment of the President's phased adaptive approach, have left our allies to stand alone in the face of domestic criticism and Russian opposition.

Our relationship with the Polish Government has yet to fully recover, and I am concerned that this administration may repeat the same relationship-straining affront with our Romanian allies. The President and his administration must address the damage done to our relationships with our NATO allies as a result of their failed missile defense strategies.

In addition, I am concerned that the administration fails to recognize the significance of the emerging threats

from North Korea and Iran which places the United States at risk. The administration should inform Congress of the effects of the abandoned and failed Obama administration phased adaptive approach and of their plan to complete the Bush administration's Alaska missile defense strategy.

Further, since completion of the Alaska missile field alone is insufficient for the full protection of the United States, I am calling upon the administration to support the site selection and completion of a United States east coast missile field to complement the Alaska site.

The world is not becoming a safer place. Offering to weaken our defenses in hopes of irrational nations suspending their weapons programs is not an effective strategy to protect the United States. Simply put, these offers are of greater benefit to our adversaries than to the protection of the American people. They are to the detriment of the American people.

THE PASSING OF HELEN L. DOHERTY APRIL 17, 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. This month, the San Gabriel Valley lost a wonderful leader, the Native American community lost a true champion, and I lost a dear friend. Helen Doherty wore many hats throughout her years of public service, but one thing remained constant among them all: she fought to make life better for those around her. All people were her family; all children were her children.

Helen's actions were always guided by the needs of younger generations. An educator at heart, she spent four decades in public school classrooms. She taught where she was needed most—where the value of a lesson learned would have the greatest impact—places like the Bridges Community Day School, where she worked with young people who had worn out their welcome in the traditional school system through expulsion, drug use, or family problems. None of that mattered to Helen. What mattered was helping kids build a brighter future for themselves, one new lesson at a time.

But being an educator meant more to Helen than teaching in schools. It meant being a good colleague as well. She was a devoted member of the California Teachers Association and won their California Teacher in Politics award.

Helen's compassion for others led her to speak out and fight for those in need. Much of her activism was rooted in who she was as a member of the Cherokee Nation. She had personal insights into the needs of Native American communities, and she fought tirelessly to have them addressed. By the time she was in college at UCLA, she had personally felt the pains of intolerance directed at her and her heritage.

□ 1030

Determined to change the wrong she faced, Helen boarded a bus and rode clear across the country to hear Martin Luther King deliver his "I Have a Dream" speech. That dream was her dream. His message was her message, and she fulfilled it each and every day for the rest of her life.

Helen worked side by side with the Gabrielino Tribe to help them gain recognition and joined the Morongo Nation in promoting human rights. She took those challenges and struggles that are unique to reservation life and raised awareness for solutions.

Her efforts helped ensure those facing difficult conditions on reservation land had the education to build a brighter future. She held workshops on tribal lands to help people develop the skills needed to improve their quality of life, and she worked hard to ensure that textbooks in California accurately reflected the true history of the Native people. As her advocacy led to public service, Helen was a founder and chair of the Native American Caucus for the California Democratic Party—one of the first Native American caucuses for a State party.

Helen left us not long ago, but her impact lives on. The lives she touched are forever changed for the better as are the communities she fought to empower. Her life's work provides an inspiration for all of us. So, today, I bid farewell to a friend, a mentor, and a true role model to so many.

And I say thank you for all that you've done for us, Helen Doherty.

UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the recent actions taken by the President of the Ukraine, Mr. Yanukovych.

On April 7, President Yanukovych pardoned former Interior Minister Lutsenko, former Environmental Minister Filipchuk, and four others. These pardons demonstrate Ukraine's desire to integrate democratic policies and reform their justice system as the expanding Eastern European nation continues its transition towards democracy.

This action is a concrete step in the right direction for President Yanukovych's administration, but there remains much to be done in order for Ukraine's judicial system to be considered in line with Western standards. This would include an end to all political persecutions; and, today, I reiterate my call for the release of Ms. Yulia Tymoshenko, the former Prime Minister.

I have long been a supporter of our Nation's ability to assist new, emerging democracies as they develop the pillars for building successful and lasting governments. I am encouraged by

these recent steps and hope that Ukraine continues on its path towards full European integration. The United States Government welcomes President Yanukovych's decision to pardon Mr. Lutsenko and Mr. Filipchuk and hopes that such actions signal an end to the political persecution of other opposition figures.

KEEP YOSEMITE TOURIST-FRIENDLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I rise today in strong opposition to a proposal by the National Park Service to remove longstanding tourist facilities from Yosemite National Park, including bicycle and raft rentals, snack facilities, gift shops, horseback riding, the ice skating rink at Curry Village, tennis courts and swimming pools, the art center, and the historic stone Sugar Pine Bridge.

These facilities date back generations and provide visitors with a wide range of amenities to enhance their stay at and their enjoyment of this world-renowned national park. To add insult to insanity, all of this comes with a quarter-billion-dollar price tag to American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, Yosemite belongs to the American people, and the Park Service's job is to welcome them and accommodate them when they visit their park, not to restrict and harass them. Indeed, Yosemite was set aside nearly 150 years ago by legislation signed by Abraham Lincoln specifically for "the public use, resort and recreation for all time." This proposal fundamentally changes the entire purpose for which Yosemite was set aside in the first place.

Tourists don't go where they're not welcomed. Yosemite competes with thousands of vacation destinations; and the more inconvenient and unpleasant Park managers make it for Yosemite visitors, the fewer visitors they're going to have. Now, that might be convenient to them, but it will devastate the economy of all of the surrounding communities whose economies depend upon tourism.

The Park Service is attempting to justify this as a court-ordered response to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. This is disingenuous. The settlement agreement they refer to simply requires that a plan be adopted consistent with current law. It does not mandate such radical changes in longstanding visitor services and amenities.

Former Congressman Tony Coelho, who authored the act that designated the Merced under provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, has just released a strong letter condemning the proposal, saying in no uncertain terms:

The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act was never intended to apply to the Merced River within

Yosemite National Park at all. The Merced River within Yosemite National Park is protected and regulated by the National Park Service and has never needed an overlay of inconsistent and confusing regulation. The Merced River in Yosemite Valley has been recreational for almost 150 years. Yosemite Valley has never been wilderness. Any plan which proceeds should not change any infrastructure or ban any activities traditionally carried on in Yosemite Valley.

Indeed, when Mr. Coelho authored the legislation designating the Merced as "wild and scenic," these tourist facilities already existed, and nowhere in the bill's findings is there any mention of an intention to force their closure or to override Park policies. In fact, many of the facilities slated for removal are not even on the Merced River and do not in any way impede or affect its flow.

The officials of the National Park Service are clearly not required to take these actions. It's becoming increasingly apparent that they want to take them and that they intend to take them despite widespread public opposition from all but the most radical elements of the environmental left. Indeed, when 13 members of the California congressional delegation, including liberal Democrats and conservative Republicans alike, asked for an extension of the public comment period, the Park Service grudgingly extended it by only 12 days.

It is obvious that Park officials have already made up their minds and are merely walking through the formalities. I believe that this matter and related issues of public access cry out for a congressional investigation.

In the meantime, if members of the public want to protest the elimination of many of Yosemite Valley's tourist amenities and iconic landmarks, their time is running out. My Web site, at mcclintock.house.gov, provides guidance on how people can protest this action, and I strongly urge them to do so.

THE MAJORITY'S DEFLATING AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, the 113th Congress has been in session for over 100 days; and so far, the majority has attacked worker protections, slashed important job-training programs, and has created one manufactured fiscal cliff after another.

This is the last week before yet another recess, but there is still no proposal to help Americans get back to work. Instead, we have another attack on the Affordable Care Act. Plus, we have on the floor today the Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act. I, in fact, had a balloon, Mr. Speaker, that I would have liked to have had on my wrist as I gave this speech this morning, but I was told it would not be appropriate—and maybe not.

But helium? Helium? Really?

I hate to burst the majority's bubble, but Democrats and Republicans actually agree on this bill. There was no need to take up a full day of our time to debate the bill. We could have considered it under the expedited procedures and saved time for proposals that created jobs instead of balloons. With leadership like this, it's no wonder the American people are feeling discouraged and deflated.

Helium? Helium.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Archbishop Oshagan Cholyan, Armenian Apostolic Church of America, New York, New York, offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Almighty God, we seek Your holy guidance in all our endeavors, especially in the deliberations of our leaders in this noble body, because strong and wise leadership is essential for the well-being of nations.

Today, we are mindful of another April 24—98 years ago, the beginning of the genocide of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, the first genocide among so many that followed in the 20th century.

We beseech You, O Lord, to bless this land of America and its people. Empower them to continue serving Your goodness as they did when they sheltered the remnants of the Armenian nation.

Give Your children wisdom, love, and compassion that they may live and prosper with the gifts of Your Spirit—justice, truth, freedom, and righteousness. Your name will be praised forever and ever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. VALADAO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING ARCHBISHOP OSHAGAN CHOLYAN

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative for Rhode Island's First Congressional District, which is home to many Armenian American families, I am honored to rise today in order to thank His Eminence, Archbishop Oshagan Cholyan, for offering our opening prayer and for recognizing the 98th anniversary of the start of the Armenian genocide.

A native of Aleppo, Syria, Archbishop Cholyan was first ordained into the priesthood in 1967. He attended the American University of Beirut where he majored in history and later received two master's degrees from the Princeton Theological Seminary. Since 1998, Archbishop Cholyan has served as the prelate of the Eastern Prelacy of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America and has focused his efforts on strengthening local faith communities under his jurisdiction.

On behalf of the Armenian community in my home State of Rhode Island, I am honored to welcome the archbishop here today and to join him in remembering the victims of the Armenian genocide—the systematic extermination of Armenians living under the Ottoman Empire in the early 20th century.

I join members of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues in urging that our government finally recognize the Armenian genocide as a historical fact.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE CANCER DRUG COVERAGE PARITY ACT

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, America's biomedical research industry is

the envy of the world, but the health insurance model is not keeping pace with the science. For cancer patients, this means that smart drugs purchased at a pharmacy and self-administered orally are dramatically more expensive than traditional chemotherapy administered at a hospital or at a clinic.

This makes no sense. That is why I have joined with a broad coalition of the cancer community to reintroduce the Cancer Drug Coverage Parity Act. This bill would require health insurance coverage for smart drugs and injectable treatments at the same rate. Ensuring that parity coverage exists would both increase access to life-saving treatments and improve the quality of life for cancer patients.

Mr. Speaker, a cancer patient should never be denied the most effective cancer treatment because of cost. We must make sure that coverage for cancer treatments keeps pace with the promising new therapies as they become available.

THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION'S FAILURE TO STOP TERRORISM IN THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COTTON. I rise today to express grave doubts about the Obama administration's counterterrorism policies and programs. Counterterrorism is often shrouded in secrecy—as it should be. So let us judge by the results.

In barely 4 years in office, five jihadists have reached their targets in the United States under Barack Obama: the Boston Marathon Bomber, the Underwear Bomber, the Times Square Bomber, the Fort Hood shooter, and, in my own State, the Little Rock recruiting office shooter.

In over 7 years after 9/11, under George W. Bush, how many terrorists reached their targets in the United States? Zero.

We need to ask: Why is the Obama administration failing in its mission to stop terrorism before it reaches its targets in the United States?

CURBING GUN VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, it was President John F. Kennedy who famously said, "Do not pray for easy lives. Pray to be stronger men."

Last week, some members of the United States Senate took the easy way out when they voted down the most basic measures to curb gun violence in America.

Today, I ask my friends and colleagues in this body, Democrats and Republicans alike, to pray for the courage to stand with the American people

and to refuse to accept the profound failure of the United States Senate. For the parents of those children lost in Newtown and for the families of the nearly 86 Americans who die of gunshot wounds every day, there are no easy days.

Doing what's right, like stopping criminals from buying weapons online and cracking down on illegal gun trafficking, will not cost anyone a vote at the ballot box, for the American people know that these measures don't threaten the Second Amendment; they only protect the rights of all Americans to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Speaker, too many lives have been lost, and too many lives are on the line not to get something done.

98TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

(Mr. VALADAO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the 98th anniversary of the initiation of the Armenian genocide in order to commemorate a moment in history inflicting wounds still fresh for many constituents in my congressional district.

From 1915 to 1923, the Ottoman Empire engaged in the systematic and organized deportation and extermination of over 2 million Armenians from their homeland. Although exact records were not kept, it is estimated that nearly 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children were killed and that many were permanently displaced or forced to flee. These horrific events have become known today as the Armenian genocide.

Many of those able to flee emigrated to the United States and settled in California. Today, their families continue to grow, thrive, and pass along their cultural heritage into their adopted communities. However, the sense of loss as a result of these horrific acts runs deep as many Armenian Americans personally know a friend or a family member who was unable to escape the genocide.

Despite the horrors of this time and broad international consensus that these events are rightly identified as "genocide," the foreign policy of the United States refuses to acknowledge what so many already know to be true. Today, let us recognize and remember the 2 million Armenians whose lives were lost or forever changed by these tragic events.

□ 1210

IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. VARGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of comprehensive immigration reform, and I especially want to thank

the faith communities. In particular, I want to thank the evangelical churches that were here last week.

There were over 300 either pastors or members of their church here, and I would like to read some of the things they had to say from the Christian Post. Over 300 evangelicals representing 25 States gathered in the Nation's Capitol Wednesday for worship, prayer, and meeting with Members of Congress in an effort to bring about comprehensive immigration reform.

"We're here to say that immigration reform has strong evangelical support," said the Reverend Gabriel Salguero.

There were a number of very important pastors here along with Dr. Richard Land, pastor and also a member of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Pastor Kenton Beshore writes this, describing how ministries and the church have worked with children in his community who are living without a parent due to immigration laws that have broken apart their families: "This has to change."

The pastor is correct—this has to change.

I want to thank all the faith communities. They are united to make sure that we have a comprehensive immigration reform that reflects our values, and I'd like to thank them.

ENSURING THE SAFETY OF THE MEN AND WOMEN WHO SERVE US

(Mr. ISSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, the House just recently released a five-separate committee report requested by the Speaker of the House on the aftermath of Benghazi. It tells the American people a story that needs to be told and has not yet been completed. The story is that we did not protect our people in Benghazi.

The Embassy asked for more security. Secretary Clinton cabled back, "No," in April of 2012. On the very day, September 11, that the Ambassador was killed along with three of his colleagues, he said:

It is not a question of if, but when this attack will come.

Today, Congress has not yet seen a plan that ensures this will never happen again. The safety of our men and women all over the world in the State Department and other agencies needs to be assured.

Mr. Speaker, the House needs to address this in a way that we can have confidence that people who serve us abroad will be properly protected.

STUDENT LOAN RELIEF ACT

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago tomorrow marks the anniversary of the Federal Reserve Board reporting that student loan debt exceeded \$1 trillion. What that means for the average student loan borrower in America is a debt level of \$27,000. That's just the average. Many students graduate, sadly, with debt levels of six figures.

Despite the fact that we have that looming burden on middle class families all across the country, in 67 days the Stafford student loan program interest rate will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, adding even further interest debt to students unless Congress acts.

Mr. Speaker, I've introduced H.R. 1595, the Student Loan Relief Act, with my colleague in the Senate, Senator JACK REED—we have 95 cosponsors in the House—which will extend the lower rate for 2 years and give this House time to come up with a comprehensive solution for higher education access and affordability, which, again, extends back to giving students better information for when they enter college and helping those who graduated in terms of allowing them to refinance.

It is time, however, to pass the extension of the lower rate. Let's not go backwards. Let's help middle class families all across America.

BUDGET CONFEREES

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. It's core to our job, Mr. Speaker, to pass a responsible budget. That's job number one. A budget tells us how we're going to be stewards of the taxpayer resources.

One of my first acts in Congress was to cosponsor the No Budget, No Pay Act. We now have a budget that the House has passed; we have a different budget that the Senate has passed; and the President has submitted his budget. It is now time for us to go to conference.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to appoint conferees so we can get a real budget and start moving this country forward. That is core to our job. We must produce a budget in order to start addressing our debt and deficit and making sure that the public understands what our priorities are.

Mr. Speaker, now's the time to act. I ask that you appoint conferees, and let's get this country moving forward.

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's now been 843 days since I arrived in Congress, and the Republican leadership has not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis.

At the current rate of job growth, we will not get to pre-recession unemploy-

ment levels until after 2020. This means another decade of people losing their health care, losing their homes, and losing their dignity.

Where is the outrage?

Congress is delaying America's recovery and making their plight worse by pursuing destructive policies like the sequester instead of productive policies like the President's American Jobs Act.

The American Jobs Act deserves a vote.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are looking to you to address the only deficit that matters right now: our jobs deficit. It's time for a vote on a serious jobs bill.

Our mantra here in Congress should be: jobs, jobs, jobs.

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS AND THE KENTUCKY DERBY

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I came to the floor to congratulate Virgin Islands jockey Kevin Krigger on his Santa Anita win and qualifying for the Kentucky Derby. Kevin will be riding Goldencents co-owned by Rick Pitino and trained by Doug O'Neill.

Since then, another Virgin Islands jockey, Victor Lebron, riding Frac Daddy, co-owned by Carter Stewart and Ken Schlenker and trained by Ken McPeck, has also qualified.

They are making history, and the entire Virgin Islands is gearing up to cheer wildly for them on May 4 as they make a "Run for the Roses."

Another Virgin Islander, Gareem Nicholas, is an assistant trainer for Derby-bound horse It's My Lucky Day.

As a person who grew up in a horse racing family and who has always followed the sport, I could not be prouder than to see my young men riding and training in such a prestigious event, and I hope to be there to witness it.

Although there have been many people who have had a role in the success of the young Crucian jockeys who began their career on the Randall Doc James Racetrack in my home island of St. Croix, I again congratulate their parents Averill Simmonds and Albert Krigger, Jr., and Reina and Victor Lebron, Sr. The name Julio Felix also stands out as a mentor of theirs and many other young Virgin Island jockeys.

I wish both jockeys luck in their maiden runs at the Kentucky Derby, but they and Nicholas are already winners to me and in the eyes of their fellow Virgin Islanders.

GMO LABELING

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an issue that's very

important to me, to my constituents in Hawaii, as well as to people all across the country.

I've long been a supporter of requiring labeling for food containing genetically engineered, or GE, products. Food is a basic necessity in our everyday lives, and people have a right to know what's in the food we're eating.

Today I'm joining a strong coalition, led by Senator BOXER and Congressman DEFazio, to introduce the Genetically Engineered Food Right-to-Know Act, which requires labeling of GE foods.

The Food and Drug Administration already requires labeling of more than 3,000 ingredients, additives, and processes, but it has resisted labels for GE foods. Changing this outdated policy would simply add GE foods to that robust list, which would not be cost prohibitive for companies or consumers.

More than 1.5 million Americans have filed comments with the FDA urging it to label GE foods, while surveys show more than 90 percent of people also support it.

Our legislation puts consumers first and empowers them to make informed choices for themselves and their families.

□ 1220

HARMFUL EFFECTS OF SEQUESTRATION

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it has now been more than 7 weeks since the sequestration cuts were enacted, and we are in new and unprecedented territory. Furlough notices have already been sent to thousands of Federal employees and contractors, and many services are beginning to slow. While many of the worst consequences of the sequester have not yet been realized, the truth is that the wheels have been set in motion, and we are on a course that will have real impacts for millions of Americans.

As a result of employee furloughs, more than 1,200 flights were delayed yesterday because 1,500 air traffic controllers were laid off the job. Because of the Republican majority's refusal to address the effects of sequester sensibly, the FAA estimates that a third of the passengers will face delays during the furloughs, with up to 6,700 flights arriving late at more than a dozen major airports each day.

Beyond crippling our government's ability to provide critical services, the Republican sequestration plan is slowing the economic growth that our country so desperately needs.

In short, Republicans are putting the ability of our government to fully perform basic government functions that we need to keep us safe at risk.

We need to work on an approach that will fix sequestration while reducing our deficit sensibly.

We need to come to a compromise that will prevent these indiscriminate cuts, and keep our economy on track and growing.

ADDRESSING GUN VIOLENCE

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, over 100,000 victims of gun violence last year, many of them children. What has this House done to prevent other children from being added to this tragic tally? Nothing, Mr. Speaker. Absolutely nothing.

Ninety percent of Americans support effective background checks—90 percent. So when does this Chamber, the people's House, work for the 10 percent? Opponents have said that background checks will not stop every incidence of gun violence. Well, true. They would, unfortunately, not stop all future acts of gun violence, anymore than other laws stop all illegal behavior—but it would stop some. It would save the lives of some of our children. It would be all of us saying we have a moral duty to ensure that those purchasing handguns are not an established threat to our families, and it would be the start of a comprehensive approach to protecting our families.

Congress plays politics on so many issues. Let's not play politics with the lives of so many innocent Americans.

APPOINT BUDGET CONFEREES

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, my constituents and the American people deserve a budget. One of our principal duties in Congress is to pass a budget. Yet Congress has already missed the legal deadline this year because the Republican leadership has not yet appointed conferees to continue budget deliberations.

Yesterday, I joined many of my colleagues in signing a resolution calling on the GOP leadership to appoint conferees to a conference committee to continue working on the fiscal year 2014 budget.

After years of calling for regular order and for the Senate to pass a budget, which they did in March, I now find it ironic that Republicans are dragging their feet and stalling budget negotiations by refusing to appoint conferees.

We certainly have differences of opinion regarding budget priorities, Mr. Speaker; but that's no excuse for continued dysfunction and delay.

I ask you to appoint conferees today, and let's work to find a bipartisan compromise on a budget. Democrats stand ready to act to pass a budget that grows our economy, creates jobs, strengthens the middle class, and replaces the reckless, across-the-board sequester cuts.

UNIVERSAL BACKGROUND CHECKS

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD a letter that I received today from a 7-year-old in my district:

Dear Congresswoman Kuster. My name is Noah Dutille. I am a second grader at Plymouth Elementary School. I am hoping that you will help make sure no other kids are hurt by guns. Thank you for your service. Sincerely, Noah.

In my district, 90 percent of my constituents support universal background checks, including 75 percent of those who are members of the National Rifle Association. Mr. Speaker, 6.5 million guns sold each year in the United States are sold by unlicensed private sellers, including online and gun show sales, and 40-50 percent of all gun sales have no criminal background check. In fact, a recent national survey of inmates revealed that 80 percent of those who used a handgun in a crime acquired it through a private transfer.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Noah and all of the families in my district, I ask that we schedule a vote to keep our families safe.

BUDGET CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly, Republicans have reprimanded Senate Democrats, claiming budget negotiations have stalled because the Senate has failed to pass a budget. Now, Senate Democrats have done their part. Republican leaders in the House must do the same by convening a conference committee to resolve our budget differences openly and honestly. That is a procedure that the Congress has always followed. That is regular order.

The best interests of the American people shouldn't have to sit on the back burner any longer. Unemployment remains too high, wages are stagnant, and sequestration is taking its toll. We need to address our country's challenges and create jobs, reduce the deficit, and strengthen our middle class while creating ladders of opportunity for those to climb into the middle class.

These are our top priorities. Sometimes these priorities get lost in the shuffle of partisan bickering. I urge Republican leadership to follow regular order and create a conference committee now.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, opponents of comprehensive immigration

reform will do anything to stop progress in today's world. Now they're using the terrorist attacks in Boston to somehow draw some connection between those events and the problems that really plague our immigration system. There is no connection, but problems still remain.

We still have to secure our borders. We still have to make sure that employers are only employing legal Americans. We still have 11 million undocumented people in this country. We don't know why they're here or who they are. We still need seasonal workers for many economic activities. We still need highly skilled workers—engineers and technicians—some of whom have been trained here but cannot work here. We still have people overstaying their visas, and we still have the problem that we need to increase the flow of immigration to stimulate our economy.

Delaying immigration reform will only weaken our economy and make us less safe. It is much better that we know everyone who is in our country, why they're here, and make sure they're paying taxes and contributing to American society. We need to pass immigration reform now.

GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, I and 19 of my colleagues wrote to the Energy and Commerce Committee urging them to engage us in a debate on the House floor as to what our national policy should be in response to climate change. That request has been met with silence, but that's a more preferable response than the 53 votes that the House undertook during the last session to block the Obama administration from using its existing authority to address climate change.

In fact, for the year 2012, when this House voted to overturn a scientific finding that, in fact, climate change was occurring, we experienced the warmest year on record. More than half of this Nation's counties were declared Federal disaster areas, due mostly to drought, but also to extreme weather events. We experienced the second worst year of extreme weather events. In fact, Hurricane Sandy cost the Federal Government more than \$65 billion and took the lives of 147 Americans, and we experienced the third worst year for wildland fires; more than 9 million acres were burned.

These severe temperatures and extreme weather events we are experiencing all fit the predictive pattern of global climate change. Our failure to take action dooms future generations to ever more powerful and destructive weather events, altered coastlines, more devastating droughts and

wildland fires, and greater food scarcity. It's time to take action on climate change.

□ 1230

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

NATIONAL BASEBALL HALL OF FAME COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1071) to specify the size of the precious-metal blanks that will be used in the production of the National Baseball Hall of Fame commemorative coins.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1071

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SIZE OF PRECIOUS-METAL BLANKS.

Section 3(a) of the National Baseball Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act (Public Law 112-152) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “have” and inserting “be struck on a planchet having a”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “have a” and inserting “be struck on a planchet having a”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 1071.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1071, introduced by our colleague from New York (Mr. HANNA), along with Mr. DOYLE and Mr. GIBSON, two other Representatives from the State of New York.

This is a two-line amendment of the most technical sort. It amends the National Baseball Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act, sponsored by Mr. HANNA and Mr. DOYLE, and passed last

year by this Congress. The legislation calls for the Mint to strike and issue next year's coins in commemoration of the Hall of Fame's 75th anniversary.

The coin will be domed, Mr. Speaker, the first of that kind ever done by the Mint. As they did the technical work of preparing to produce the coin, the Mint discovered that using a standard coin blank and stamping the center part into a dome drew the edges of the coin inward a few thousandths of an inch; not a big deal, but enough to be out of spec with the finished size of the coin designated in the legislation.

To avoid making a coin not in compliance with the law, or having to purchase expensive custom coin blanks, this bill simply eliminates the requirement for the finished size and specification that the coins be struck on standard commemorative coin blanks. The result will be a less expensive coin and less work for the Mint.

This is truly a technical amendment, Mr. Speaker. I urge its quick passage.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1071. The bill corrects the specification of the precious metal blanks to be used by the U.S. Mint in making the National Baseball Hall of Fame coins which Congress authorized last term. This correction will result in a cost savings, permitting the U.S. Mint to implement the design specifications using standard-sized blanks and produce the coins by January 2014, the required deadline.

Last Congress, I voted in favor of minting the National Baseball Hall of Fame commemorative coin. Proceeds from the coin will go to the National Baseball Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, New York, to help fulfill its mission of preserving history, honoring excellence, and connecting generations through the rich history of our national pastime.

One of the most popular exhibits at the Hall of Fame is that of Jackie Robinson, who broke the color barrier in 1947, bringing his amazing skills from the Negro League to win Rookie of the Year his first year. He led the Brooklyn Dodgers to 6 pennants in 10 seasons, including their own World Series in 1955. He was the 1949 National League Most Valuable Player. Jackie Robinson was elected to the Hall of Fame in 1962, after his phenomenal career. Most importantly, he showed tremendous grace and poise as he integrated the major leagues and served as an inspiration to so many of us in generations to come. The number he wore—42—as a Brooklyn Dodger has been retired in his honor, and no other ball player can wear that number again.

Baseball is also a wonderful pastime in my own district of Birmingham, Alabama, where we have a minor league team, the Birmingham Barons, and enjoy the baseball.

I ask for passage of H.R. 1071 and urge my colleagues to approve this bill. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA), who is the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HANNA. I thank the chairman emeritus for yielding and for his strong support of the National Baseball Hall of Fame commemorative coin bill.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Mint is working hard to produce spectacular coins next year honoring the National Baseball Hall of Fame's 75th anniversary.

As called for in the legislation I authored in last year's Congress, the coin will be unique in the history of the Mint. It will be domed, with the back of the coin depicting stitches that appear on a major league baseball.

In doing the production work, the Mint discovered that the work to make the coin domed would make the finished coin slightly smaller than the standard finished commemorative coin. I am pleased the Mint has brought this to our attention and asked that we do a technical amendment to allow them to use standard coin blanks, instead of having to secure expensive custom ones.

Since all production costs of commemorative coins are passed on to the consumer, this will keep the cost of these coins down for baseball fans around the world who want to commemorate 75 years of collecting, displaying, and honoring our national pastime.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill that actually saves money and effort, and I urge its immediate passage.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And it's a great privilege to rise today in support of this bill.

I'm proud to represent Cooperstown in upstate New York, home of the Baseball Hall of Fame. Baseball, America's pastime, is something that unites us and I think also something that engenders hope throughout our country, the feeling that we all have in April, the possibility that our team could go all the way and win the World Series, something, indeed, that unites us.

A coin is a fitting way to honor the Hall of Fame and also help our efforts for tourism in central New York. And this bill and this coin are able to do all that at no cost to the taxpayer.

I might also say that this competition where we now have children from across the country that are involved in this competition to provide the best design is, I think, going to kindle even more support for baseball. And so I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I thank Mr. HANNA for his leadership and the chairman for the opportunity to speak this morning in support of it.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my New York colleagues for

bringing this bill. Obviously, those of us who visited Cooperstown, it's a wonderful place, and I can really think of no better way to start the celebration of the 75th anniversary than to go view the film, "42," about Jackie Robinson.

□ 1240

Baseball has a rich history. It has a history, as with other sports, of bringing people together, putting aside their personal, emotional, or ideological differences. It is a wonderful movie and a lesson for all of us.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1071.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO ADDIE MAE COLLINS, DENISE McNAIR, CAROLE ROBERTSON, AND CYNTHIA WESLEY

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 360) to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley to commemorate the lives they lost 50 years ago in the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church, where these 4 little Black girls' ultimate sacrifice served as a catalyst for the Civil Rights Movement, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 360

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress Finds the following:

(1) September 15, 2013 will mark 50 years since the lives of Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley were suddenly taken by a bomb planted in the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama.

(2) The senseless and premature death of these 4 little Black girls sparked "The Movement that Changed the World."

(3) On that tragic Sunday in September of 1963, the world took notice of the violence inflicted in the struggle for equal rights.

(4) The fact that 4 innocent children lost their lives as they prepared for Sunday School shook the world's conscience.

(5) This tragedy galvanized the Civil Rights Movement and sparked a surge of momentum that helped secure the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and later the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by President Lyndon B. Johnson.

(6) Justice was delayed for these 4 little Black girls and their families until 2002, 39 years after the bombing, when the last of the 4 Klansmen responsible for the bombing was charged and convicted of the crime.

(7) The 4 little Black girls are emblematic of so many who have lost their lives for the

cause of freedom and equality, including Virgil Ware and James Johnny Robinson who were children also killed within hours of the 1963 church bombing.

(8) The legacy that these 4 little Black girls left will live on in the minds and hearts of us all for generations to come.

(9) Their extraordinary sacrifice sparked real and lasting change as Congress began to aggressively pass legislation that ensured equality.

(10) Sixteenth Street Baptist Church remains a powerful symbol of the movement for civil and human rights and will host the 50th anniversary ceremony on Sunday, September 15, 2013.

(11) It is befitting that Congress bestow the highest civilian honor, the Congressional Gold Medal, in 2013 to the 4 little Black girls, Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley, posthumously in recognition of the 50th commemoration of the historical significance of the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the presentation, on behalf of Congress, of a gold medal of appropriate design to commemorate the lives of Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary") shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) AWARD OF MEDAL.—Following the award of the gold medal described in subsection (a), the medal shall be given to the Birmingham Civil Rights Institute in Birmingham, AL, where it shall be available for display or temporary loan to be displayed elsewhere, as appropriate.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under section 2, at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medal, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and amounts received from the sale of such duplicates shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

SEC. 4. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—The medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to manage this bill and to have worked with my colleague and the sponsor of this legislation, Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL, who is the driving force behind this legislation. She's worked tirelessly to bring this bill to the floor, and it has come to the floor with bipartisan support. Through her work, and those of many Members on both sides, including the Alabama delegation, we're proud that this bill has 296 Members as co-sponsors.

The bill, as the title reflects, posthumously awards a Congressional Gold Medal that recognizes these four little African American girls. Their pictures are on the floor of the House. You can see their very tender age. Their lives were cut short by a bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham on September 15, 1953. Many trace this decisive and heinous act to an impetus for a passage of the historical Civil Rights Act of 1964. There was a national revulsion caused by the deaths of these innocent lives, the calculated bombing in a place of worship. It was, indeed, a sad day for the entire country.

It can correctly be said that 50 years ago my hometown found itself the epicenter of the civil rights movement. The images of conflicts and violence from Birmingham that flickered nationally on what were still predominantly black-and-white TV screens shocked the conscience of the Nation and, I believe, most citizens of Alabama.

During the recent Faith and Politics Congressional Civil Rights Pilgrimage to Alabama, a large bipartisan delegation of Members viewed some of the historic sites in Birmingham. We were led on the pilgrimage by my friend and Congresswoman SEWELL's friend, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, who, from personal experience, spoke authoritatively about those years. As we know, he was beaten many times himself.

The Sixteenth Street Baptist Church is still a vibrant place of worship. Just a few months ago, we stood in a moment of silence in remembrance of the haunting act of evil that occurred there a half century ago.

Churchgoers gathered peacefully on that beautiful fall morning, as they faithfully did every Sunday, to praise, pray, and worship. In fact, 26 children were making their way to the downstairs assembly room to prepare for a sermon, entitled, "The Love That Forgives," when the bomb went off. The four little girls, whose pictures are on the floor of the House—Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley—were almost instantly killed.

Looking at those faces now, they speak as strongly to me on the House floor today as they did to newspaper readers and television viewers at the time of the bombing. As a Congress and

a country, our eyes were opened and we were shocked enough to finally pass civil rights legislation affirming that the rights and protections of the U.S. Constitution do not depend on what color your skin happens to be.

The civil rights struggle was long and hard, filled with both sorrow and joy. There's a special place in history and in our hearts for all of those who were killed and injured in Birmingham.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleague, SPENCER BACHUS, as we begin consideration of our bill, H.R. 360. I am proud to have had the entire Alabama delegation, Representatives BONNER, ADERHOLT, ROGERS, ROBY, and BROOKS, as well as Alabama natives Representatives LEWIS and BISHOP, join me as original cosponsors on this legislation. I am also thankful for the leadership of both parties, Speaker BOEHNER, Leader PELOSI, Majority Leader CANTOR, Whips HOYER and MCCARTHY, as well as Financial Services Committee Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS, for their support and leadership. I also want to thank the more than 296 Members of Congress who cosponsored this bill.

H.R. 360 requests that Congress bestow its highest civilian honor, the Congressional Gold Medal, to Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley, who tragically lost their lives during the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in 1963. These beautiful girls never got a chance to live out their promise, but their lives were not in vain. As Dr. King said at their funeral, "They are the martyred heroines of a holy crusade for freedom and human dignity."

At 10:23 on Sunday, September 15, 1963, amid high racial tensions, a bomb went off in the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church as people gathered to worship for Sunday. The explosion killed four little girls who were in the basement bathroom preparing to return for Sunday school. Twenty-two people were injured by the blast, including the younger sister of Addie Mae Collins, Sarah, who survived but lost her eye.

The senseless deaths of four little girls shocked the Nation and became a galvanizing force for the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. But, Mr. Speaker, justice was long delayed because it wasn't until 37 years later, on May 18, 2000, that all four Ku Klux Klan members who planted the bomb were finally brought to justice for their crimes.

These innocent girls lost their lives much too young. Addie Mae Collins, 14, was a reserved and sweet little girl. She liked for people to be at peace around her, they said.

Denise McNair, 11 years old, was a loving and friendly child who already exhibited a take-charge and generous spirit, helping others as she went along the way.

Carole Robertson, 14, was a vivacious young girl who was an avid reader and played the clarinet in the band.

Cynthia Wesley, 14, was an honor student who enjoyed playing the saxophone in her school band. That fateful Sunday was going to be her first day serving as an usher in church.

Although there are many individuals and events of the civil rights movement that rightfully are worthy of recognition, the selection of the four little girls was emblematic of so many who sacrificed and lost their lives for the cause of freedom.

□ 1250

Medgar Evers, Emmett Till, Jimmy Lee Jackson, as well as Virgil Ware and James Johnny Robinson—who was also killed within hours of the 1963 bombing—they were all martyrs for justice whom we should never forget. It was their blood which was shed for the bounty that so many of us now enjoy.

While we recognize that this medal cannot in any way replace the lives lost nor the injuries suffered as a result of the horrific bombing, I hope this medal serves as a powerful reminder of the importance of the many sacrifices made and the great achievements obtained so that this Nation could live up to its ideals of equality and justice for all.

This Nation should never forget those who marched, those who prayed and died in the pursuit of civil rights and social change. It is my sincere hope that their families will receive this highest civilian honor in the humble spirit in which it was intended.

I am delighted today to be joined by the sisters of Denise McNair and Carole Robertson, and the president of the Birmingham Civil Rights Institute, who are all in the gallery as witnesses to this debate today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation in honoring the lives of these four girls as we pay tribute to their families and recognize the enormous progress that we as a Nation have obtained.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

This recognition is long overdue, and I am grateful to this body for its consideration during this 50th anniversary year.

Dr. King offered the best rationale for granting this Gold Medal in the eulogy that he made at their funerals. He poignantly acknowledged:

History has proven over and over again that unmerited suffering is redemptive. The innocent blood of these girls may well have served as a redemptive force that will bring new light to this dark city. The Holy Scripture says, "A little child shall lead them." The death of these little children may lead our whole Southland from the low road of man's inhumanity to man to the high road of peace and brotherhood.

I urge my colleagues to support this Gold Medal bill so that this country can finally recognize the redemptive

force that the deaths of these four girls made in bringing light to a dark Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that it is not in order to draw to the attention of the House occupants in the gallery.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, in March, I had the honor to join my friends from Alabama in traveling to Birmingham as part of the 13th annual Congressional Civil Rights Pilgrimage. I was joined by my esteemed colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS of Georgia, who led the delegation to numerous landmarks that defined the civil rights movement at the time, including the tragedy that occurred at the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church.

The legislation we are considering today comes 50 years after the senseless death of four young girls when a bomb exploded in their church one Sunday morning in September of 1963.

Less than a month before this bombing, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., stood on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial—not far from where I stand today in the House Chamber—and declared that he dreamed of a day where all people could coexist and thrive together in peace and justice. The echo of his call for peaceful protest was still fresh in the mind of millions when it was replaced by the violent explosion at the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church, which injured dozens and killed the four innocent girls. Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley did not live to see Dr. King's dream realized, but their tragic deaths catalyzed the civil rights movement and produced a backlash against these unthinkable acts of violence across the country.

As we have seen in recent tragedies, acts of violence often produce the opposite outcome than that desired by the perpetrators. Less than 1 year after the bomb went off at the church, the Civil Rights Act passed out of this very Chamber and became law in 1964. A year later, in 1965, this Chamber passed and put into law the Voting Rights Act.

Today, the House continues to act. The legislation before us awards the Congressional Gold Medal—which is the highest civilian honor given by Congress—to the four girls whose sacrifice advanced the march of freedom in this country. Their memory is rightly recognized by those who love justice, and it is befitting that we should honor them with the highest recognition.

I am proud to support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. I rise today in support of H.R. 360.

The bill posthumously honors the lives of Addie Mae Collins, Denise

McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley who were tragically lost 50 years ago in the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama. The horror of this senseless act of violence stunned the Nation and served as a catalyst for the civil rights movement.

I would like to thank my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee, especially Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL and Chairman Emeritus SPENCER BACHUS, for their work to ensure that these girls receive our highest civilian honor as we commemorate the 50th anniversary of their deaths.

The Sixteenth Street Baptist Church was not an accidental bombing target for the perpetrators. Rather, members of the Ku Klux Klan deliberately targeted the church, designing their attack to strike fear into the hearts of those seeking equal rights. The church was a known sanctuary for civil rights leaders, including Dr. Martin Luther King, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the Congress on Racial Equality which had become involved in a campaign to register African Americans to vote in Alabama.

On that fateful morning of September 13, 1963, roughly 1 month after the March on Washington, the girls went to Sunday school to hear a sermon entitled "The Love that Forgives" when the bomb exploded, killing them and injuring many others. The bombers had hidden under a set of cinder block steps on the side of the church, tunneled under the basement, and placed a bundle of dynamite under what turned out to be the girls restroom.

The cruelty and violence of this act shocked the Nation and drew international attention to the violent struggle for civil rights, inspiring a wave of legislative action in Congress. By 1964, Congress had passed the Civil Rights Act, a landmark achievement in the fight to outlaw discrimination. By 1965, Congress had passed the Voting Rights Act, which aimed to eliminate voting restrictions that unjustly disenfranchised qualified voters.

I thank you, Ms. SEWELL, for your leadership on this issue and helping this Nation to remember what took place on that day.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to stand before the House today in support of this award to honor Addie Mae Collins, Cynthia Wesley, Carole Robertson, and Denise McNair by awarding them the Congressional Gold Medal.

The 50th anniversary of the attack on the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham is a strong reminder of how many people fought and died in the civil rights movement so that this country could live up to its founding ideals of equality and opportunity.

On a recent trip to Selma, Alabama, I had the opportunity to stand shoulder

to shoulder with Congressman JOHN LEWIS and other civil rights heroes who stood on the front lines and fought to change America for the better. We must never forget the hardships they confronted and sacrifices they made.

While reflecting on such moments in our history, and by honoring those who come before us, I look forward to continuing to focus on ways in which we all can stand together once again and continue to solve our Nation's problems and move forward in unison.

I would like to thank Congresswoman SEWELL, Congressman BACHUS, and the rest of the Alabama delegation for their hard work on this matter and bringing it forward.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), my mentor and a great leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 360. This timely legislation will provide for the posthumous awarding of the Congressional Gold Medal to Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley. These four precious girls were killed in the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama, 50 years ago this year.

□ 1300

1963 was a pivotal year in the struggle for civil rights in our Nation. It marked 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation and was the year of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s, stirring "Letter from Birmingham City Jail," which sounded the call for nonviolent civil disobedience to counter oppression in the Jim Crow South. In that letter, Dr. King famously proclaimed:

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of those efforts, I know that the struggle for justice, empowerment, and equal opportunity for all continues to this day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CLYBURN. I want to thank my colleague, Representative TERRI SEWELL, for her leadership in this outstanding effort. Representative SEWELL has quickly made her mark in this institution for her tireless devotion to duty and her thoughtful approach to legislating. I am proud to join her in this effort and urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BONNER).

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, this is the right thing to do at the right time and for the right reasons. Hopefully, in some small way, this legislation will bring some form of closure to a cowardly act, one so outrageous that it became a turning point in the passage of the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964.

On behalf of the people of Alabama, I want to say a special thank you to our

colleague, Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL, as well as the dean of our delegation, Congressman SPENCER BACHUS, for their example of working together hand in hand to bring this very appropriate bill to the floor for consideration and for a vote.

While nothing that we do here will ever replace the loss of these four innocent young girls, especially to their families and to their loved ones who have lived with a void in their hearts for the last 50 years, may this action today ensure that their spirit lives on forever.

With that, I urge the adoption of this bill.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished leader of the Democratic Party, the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished colleague, Congresswoman SEWELL, for yielding.

As you can see, there are many of us who are very eager. Our distinguished Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER, and I have had the privilege—he, more than I—to travel to Alabama with JOHN LEWIS. And thank you this morning for informing the Members that that's a transformative experience. Anybody who travels there and sees what happened in the lifetime of many of us here, and certainly in the lifetime of everyone's parents here, in our very own country cannot help but be moved. So I'm pleased to be joining you, Congresswoman SEWELL, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BISHOP, and other colleagues in coming to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, as we are all acknowledging, 50 years ago, on a Sunday morning, four precious little girls walked into the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama, the same day they did every week.

These four little girls were there for Sunday school. They were not civil rights activists; they were not agitators or advocates. They had simply come to church to learn, to pray, to be with their friends and classmates. When you visit there, you see they didn't really have a chance. They were in such close quarters when they went down those steps and the rest.

These four little girls did not enter the church seeking to become symbols of the struggle of equality; yet, in a moment of brutal, horrific, unspeakable tragedy, they would become icons of a movement for justice. The names Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley remain seared in the hearts and minds of us today as painful reminders of a dark moment in our history.

For their families, for their friends, for their loved ones, their loss in a bombing at the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church would change their world forever. Yet even at that time of great change across our country, little did we know that their deaths would change our world forever too.

Among the many milestones of the civil rights movement, September 15,

1963, may be bestowed with some of the greatest pain and anguish. But it was on that day, as this resolution states:

The House took notice of the violence inflicted in the struggle for equal rights.

It was that day that stirred the conscience of our Nation, galvanized the forces of justice, and spurred the momentum to pass the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act—landmark steps in righting the wrongs in our country's past.

It was on that day that the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church became a symbol in the cause of human rights and human dignity, from the streets of Birmingham to communities nationwide. It was that day that once again reinforced what Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., just weeks earlier, called the "fierce urgency of now."

These four girls made the ultimate sacrifice in the battle for civil rights, joining too many fellow Americans in paying for freedom with their lives.

This weekend, I will join the Southern Poverty Law Center to rename and rededicate the Civil Rights Memorial in Montgomery, Alabama. This memorial is a tribute to 40 individuals killed during the struggle. It is a place to remember the fallen, to take heed of their message, to deepen our understanding, and to renew our commitment to equal rights under the law.

They were four small little children going to church—four students, four daughters, four members of a tight-knit community in Birmingham. Four lives ended too soon; four victims to the forces of hatred and prejudice, racism, and injustice. Their senseless and premature deaths ignited the fires of progress and fanned the flames of equality.

I thank the gentlelady, one of our new, not brand-new, but newer Members of Congress, for coming here and joining with colleagues Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BONNER, certainly JOHN LEWIS, and Members of Congress not representing Alabama, but from Alabama. As the resolution that she presents declares, the legacy that these four little Black girls left will live in the minds and hearts of all for generations to come.

To honor that legacy, to cherish their memories, to inscribe their names once more in the pages of history, it is only fitting to bestow our highest civilian honor, the highest honor that Congress can bestow on a civilian, the Congressional Gold Medal, on these four Americans. That will be a glorious day in the Capitol when we all come together under the rotunda, under the dome of the Capitol, to remember them. I hope that is a comfort to their families. They gave so much. So much sprang from that, and we will always remember.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues, as mentioned, in support of H.R. 360, and to honor the memory of Addie Mae Col-

lins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley, who lost their lives at the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham.

What we do here today honors these four innocent young girls, whose lives were sacrificed in an act of hatred and of violence. And no doubt their deaths, as has been mentioned, marked a significant turning point in the civil rights movement of the 1960s.

As Congressman BACHUS mentioned in his opening remarks, these four young girls, who ranged in age from 11 to 14, were walking into the basement of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church to hear a sermon that was ironically entitled, "The Love That Forgives." Though they could not have known at the time, these four little girls changed the course of history for our Nation. Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley's young lives were cut short on September 15, 1963, but their legacy still lives on today, especially with what we do here, by the Congressional Medal of Honor, which is America's highest civilian honor.

□ 1310

I want to thank my colleague Ms. SEWELL for her leadership on this bill, and I am a proud supporter of H.R. 360. I also thank Mr. BACHUS for this time to speak on the legislation.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Democratic whip, my dear friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank Congresswoman SEWELL for her leadership and for yielding this time, and I thank my good friend SPENCER BACHUS for his leadership as well, and I congratulate him and his family for the courage they showed at a time of great stress that this Gold Medal reflects.

Mr. Speaker, the recognition for the victims of this terrible tragedy that befell our whole country on September 15, 1963, is absolutely appropriate, and it is an opportunity for us to say once again the respect we have for these young girls, the respect we have for their families. I say "our whole country" because a wound opened in the soul of America that day from a heinous act of racism and terror.

Those who set a bomb inside the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church that Sunday did so because they believed in a Nation where not all are created equal, where not all are entitled to life and liberty. On that day, many Americans who had turned away with indifference could no longer look away.

Since that day, we have forcefully declared to future generations that America will not be that Nation that looks away. In America, we strive to protect our children from hurt and harm no matter the color of their skin, their faith, their national origin. We hold fast to the values and memory of these four little girls who were killed that day, not the twisted, warped, hateful ideals of their killers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BACHUS. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Their names have been mentioned but warrant re-mentioning: Addie Mae Collins, Cynthia Wesley, Carole Robertson, and Denise McNair—four of God's children, four beautiful assets of America.

If you go down into the basement of the church, you see their pictures, you see the memorial—and your heart cries. They were brutally murdered while attending Sunday school, as the leader, SPENCER BACHUS, and as TERRI SEWELL have related.

My colleagues, let us honor their lives and their faith in the face of the evil of segregation and prejudice and hate. Let us remember the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., from the funeral of three of those four little girls. He said this:

They have something to say to each of us in their death. Their death says to us that we must work passionately and unrelentingly for the realization of the American Dream.

That fight began with the Declaration of Independence: that we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men—and, surely, Jefferson meant mankind, women as well—are endowed by God, not by the Constitution and not by our votes on this floor, with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

These four little girls had those robbed that day. Let us recommit ourselves. Let us recommit ourselves to that proposition and to unrelentingly and courageously ensure that that dream, that that promise is fulfilled for all of the little children of this Nation and for all the adults as well.

Let us pass this bill, Mr. Speaker, and send a message that we will never, ever forget their memory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Alabama has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alabama has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge and thank Mr. HOYER for his recognition of my father's role, of our family's. I am very proud of my father and the courage he showed.

At this time, I yield 2½ minutes to the esteemed chairman of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 360 to posthumously bestow Congress' highest civilian honor to Addie Mae Collins, Cynthia Wesley, Carole Robertson, and Denise McNair.

I also want to commend my two colleagues on the Financial Services Committee—Ms. SEWELL and our chairman emeritus, Mr. BACHUS, both from Alabama—for bringing this bill before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I was a mere child when these innocents were murdered. I am

no longer a child, but I'm the father of two small children—a 9-year-old and an 11-year-old. I cannot imagine the unspeakable horror of knowing that my children were in church and that one of the great acts of evil known in our Nation's history could be perpetrated upon them.

That act 50 years ago jarred millions in our Nation to the realization that racial prejudice and hatred had just manifested itself in pure, unimaginable evil. Within a year, this body had passed the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

In his eulogy for these four little girls, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said:

These children—unoffending, innocent and beautiful—were the victims of one of the most vicious, heinous crimes ever perpetrated against humanity. Yet, they died nobly. They are the martyred heroines of a holy crusade for freedom and human dignity.

I certainly cannot add to the words of this great American hero, martyred himself.

I will just end by saying, Mr. Speaker, it is a good and right thing that this body honor these innocent children martyrs, that we never forget, that we always confront evil, and although our Nation was founded on noble principles, we must never cease the work of making America a more perfect Union. With the passage of this bill, I think we do one small act to do that.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the dean of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I commend the sponsors of this legislation, and I urge the adoption of the bill.

It is appropriate that we should honor these four young girls who gave so much to the cause of civil rights. They gave their lives.

Just before this event, we had passed the Civil Rights Act of 1957. Immediately thereafter, we passed legislation, cosponsored by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Loser) and me, which made it a crime to travel in interstate commerce for the purpose of destroying buildings or churches. Shortly thereafter, outraged by the events that took place on this awful day, the Congress passed the '64 and then the '65 Civil Rights Acts.

□ 1320

These four beautiful children contributed in a most meaningful way to those events which caused the legislation to become law, and they saw to it that we honor their doings today with enactment of this legislation.

I rise in support of H.R. 360, legislation to award a Congressional Gold Medal to four brave little girls who tragically lost their lives 50 years ago in the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Alabama, Congresswoman SEWELL, for bringing the attention of Congress to this fateful inci-

dent that helped transform the history of our nation and for giving the victims of this attack the recognition for which they are long overdue.

I remember the day of this tragic incident, and my thoughts and prayers continue to be with the families of the victims of this senseless act of violence.

The Sixteenth Street Baptist Church bombing changed the nature of the conversation in Congress, which had stagnated in the 1950s and early 1960s.

With the strong leadership of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and other leaders in civil society, those four little girls did not die in vain.

The Birmingham bombing galvanized the nation and gave real urgency to the Civil Rights movement, which culminated in the signing of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 less than a year later, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 after that.

I was proud to stand with President Lyndon Johnson as he signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 because nothing is more important than ensuring that the rights enshrined in our Constitution are granted to everyone in our society.

In many respects, the movement that was sparked by this tragic bombing 50 years ago continues today. We must continue to make every effort to rid our nation of discrimination of any kind.

Our work today goes beyond voting rights or the right to own property. The battle we must focus on now is one of social justice.

Americans of all walks of life deserve to be treated fairly and decently, whether it's in the workplace, in our businesses, or in political discourse.

As we reflect on this tragedy, let us not forget Dr. King's wise words, which he penned from a Birmingham Jail 50 years ago this month.

He said, "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), who has visited the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church with us, and I thank him for doing that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thank my friend from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. Speaker, I rise also to urge passage in support of the bill as we commemorate the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church bombing in Birmingham.

It was a Sunday morning. It was September 15, 1963. And I think it's appropriate that we mention their names again: Addie Mae Collins, Cynthia Wesley, Carole Robertson, and Denise McNair.

They were entering their church before the 11 a.m. service when a bomb detonated on the church's east side, and the explosion killed all four young girls and maimed dozens of the parishioners there.

The bombing of that church gave further momentum in the struggle to end segregation and helped to spur support for the passage of the landmark Civil Rights Act right here in this Chamber.

Last month, many of us were honored to commemorate that event and another event that served as a catalyst for action in the civil rights move-

ment. I also joined Members of Congress in the annual pilgrimage across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, the event that marked the beating of peaceful voting civil rights marchers, known as Bloody Sunday, on March 7, 1965. And the pilgrimage was meaningful, as other Members of Congress and I reflected together on how far we've come as a country.

Bloody Sunday and the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church bombing remind us of the long and difficult struggle to end segregation; and it is immensely important, Mr. Speaker, that we commemorate these moments and these four little girls, that they led to the advancement of civil rights for the African American community and for our entire country.

Again, I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 4 minutes of my time be given to Ms. SEWELL to manage, and I reserve the balance of my time. I do that in acknowledgement of her fine work on this legislation and those of her colleagues who visited the church.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama. It has been a pleasure to not only represent Jefferson County with him, but to serve in this body with him. And I thank you for yielding me that time.

I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS); and while he may represent Georgia, we claim him as Alabama's native.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friends, Congresswoman SEWELL and Congressman BACHUS.

It is true that I grew up in Alabama, and I represent Georgia, but Alabama is in my blood.

I want to thank the two of you for bringing this resolution forward to honor these four beautiful little girls killed by a bomb while attending Sunday school on September 15, 1963, at the Sixteenth Street Baptist church.

On that Sunday, when I heard about the bombing that morning, I traveled to the city of Birmingham and stood outside of the church with my friend and my coworker, Julian Bond. We stood and we looked at the church. Later, I had an opportunity to attend the funeral of three of the little girls.

That bombing took place 18 days after Martin Luther King, Jr., had stood here in Washington and said: "I have a dream, a dream deeply rooted in the American Dream."

That was a sad day. It tore out the essence of our hearts. But we didn't give up. We didn't become bitter. We didn't become hostile. We continued. Because of what happened in Birmingham, it inspired us to go to Selma to fight for the right to vote.

I think we're doing the right thing today by honoring these four little

girls. They must be looked upon as those who gave their very lives, gave their blood to help redeem the soul of America and move us closer to a beloved community.

I wonder sometimes why, what, and how. We're a different country and we're a better country because they gave their all.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to another native of Alabama who happens to represent Georgia, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Alabama named me, but Georgia claimed me.

I remember vividly the Sunday of the bombing as a young boy in Mobile, Alabama. I'm reminded of the words of James Weldon Johnson:

Stony the road we trod,
Bitter the chastening rod,
Felt in the days when hope unborn had died;

Yet with a steady beat,
Have not our weary feet,
Come to the place for which our fathers sighed?

We have come over a way that with tears
Have been watered,

We have come, treading our path through
the blood of the slaughtered,
Out from the gloomy past,
Till now we stand at last,
Where the white gleam of our bright star is cast.

Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, Cynthia Wesley: four little girls are bright stars in the constellation shining down now as beacons of light for freedom and justice.

So today, 50 years after the senseless bombing in Birmingham, it's altogether fitting and proper that we should look back and commemorate the significance of the sacrifice of these young girls, these four young lives.

Truly, it was a turning point; and the murder of these youngsters, whose only crime was going to the bathroom in church, sparked a Nation not only to mourn the death of innocence, but to act to quell the turmoil and to move us toward freedom.

I'm happy to join my colleagues, Congresswoman SEWELL, Congressman BACHUS, and all of the colleagues here in this House, to appropriately pass legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to these four young martyrs in the fight for freedom.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the former chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I say congratulations to Ms. SEWELL and Mr. BACHUS.

I had returned home from a movie. If we went to church, we had the opportunity to do other things; and I went on to church, and so my parents allowed me to go to the movies.

When my sisters and I walked back into the house, our mother was in the

living room with some friends and they were crying. We didn't know what happened, and she said that they had killed some little black girls down in Birmingham.

I had no idea that I would eventually become deeply involved in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and I realized later that the reason for the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church is that it had been the headquarters, the meeting place of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference led by Martin Luther King, Jr.; the vice president, Ralph David Abernathy, and my father in the ministry, who wrote to me, "I am your Paul; you are my solace." And there was also Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth, who says he taught me how to preach.

□ 1330

They met there, and that was reason enough to blow up that building and kill these little girls, innocent little girls.

I was pleased in 1979 when Richard Arrington was elected mayor of Birmingham. And I remember thinking Fred Shuttlesworth had coined the term "Bombingham" because his own home was blown to bits; and on the day Richard Arrington, a Black man, was elected mayor, I said, "It is no longer Bombingham; it is now Birmingham."

Ms. SEWELL, congratulations to you. This should be done, it is being done, and it furthers the way of that name from "Bombingham" to "Birmingham."

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

What we need to fully realize is that the civil rights victories were achieved with the guiding principle of non-violence. There are many regions and nations of the world that have been trapped in endless cycles of ethnic and political violence across multiple generations that have torn the fabric of their societies and families. We always like to think that could never happen here. It did not happen during the civil rights movement because of the principle of nonviolence.

I journeyed, at JOHN LEWIS' invitation, to India where we retraced the steps of Martin Luther King as he retraced the journey of Ghandi. Dr. King took his own religious convictions, affirmed and strengthened by those of Ghandi, and brought back a powerful nonviolent movement which overcame police dogs, water hoses, brutal beatings, bombs, bullets, and acts of violence in a nonviolent way. And love carried the day against hate. That was a proud moment for our country, and it is a model as we go forward.

We in America have the right to petition our government in a peaceful way. Let us use that example and that tradition.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Alabama to manage as she sees fit and give her the right to close, which I think should be her honor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Alabama controls the remaining 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL. I again thank the gentleman from Alabama. It is indeed an honor to be able to manage the floor with you on this bill and cosponsor it with you, and I thank you for your generosity.

At this time I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, often we are taught in the Christian Baptist and African American tradition, which is paraphrasing the words of the Bible, give honor unto those upon whom honor is due. For that reason, I can give tribute to the two Members of Congress without reservation for recognizing the importance, both Congresswoman SEWELL and Congressman BACHUS, for giving honor to those families who languished for over 50 years and wondered did anybody care. We thank Congresswoman SEWELL for her great leadership and Congressman BACHUS for joining and exuding the kind of partnership, the spirit of his family tradition against all adversity, saying I want to join and to speak of nonviolence.

I rise today with great enthusiasm for H.R. 360 and say to the family members, the sisters, the friends of Addie Mae Collins, Carole Robertson, Cynthia Wesley, and Denise McNair, it has been too long.

And so we rise today to be able to make amends for justice that had not been served because of the callousness and indifference, sometimes of criminal collusion, and many times the lack of enforcement of devastation against coloreds, Blacks, Negroes, and African Americans. There was an era that we look sadly upon; but now today, in the spirit of Dr. King's message of non-violence, we are able to say yes, profoundly yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SEWELL. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady for her kindness.

We are able to now say profoundly to these girls' relatives that we honor the children who lost their future. We honor them by saying to their families, We care for you. And in the words of John F. Kennedy:

We are confronted primarily with a moral issue. It is as old as the Scriptures, and it is as clear as the American Constitution—justice delayed is sometimes justice denied.

But as Martin Luther King said in the Birmingham jail: "Go wherever injustice is."

Today on the floor of the House, we will remedy injustice. I'm delighted to be a supporter and cosponsor of this great resolution.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Alabama for yielding me this time. I want to commend her for her leadership and commend the leadership of Representative BACHUS from Alabama.

I remember that day vividly as a young activist at the time. We thought it was unbelievable that this kind of tragedy could take place. But I think it reminds all of us that yesterday is yesterday. We look forward to tomorrow, and I again commend the gentlewoman from Alabama and Mr. BACHUS for reminding us of that time and what can happen when we join hands together.

And so I thank you both.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think many times people wonder why so often we go back and give homage to our past. It's because we still suffer the damages of the past. And we don't forget the families that have given up so much just for us to be able to vote. And we still struggle for that vote. We still struggle for the right to vote, but we must continue. And I want to say to these families, and I know some of them personally, how much we appreciate the fact that they have been loyal to the cause, loyal to this country, loyal to our military, and stand strong today. And so I want to thank you very much for giving honor. I thank my colleague.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by thanking all of my colleagues, especially my colleagues from Alabama, and all of my colleagues who have participated in today's debate. It is indeed an honor and a privilege for me, a native of Selma, Alabama, a 30-year member of Brown Chapel AME Church, to have the humble honor to be a sponsor of this bill.

I know that I drink deep from wells that I didn't dig, my whole generation does. It is a long time overdue, but I just want to say humbly, Thank you, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 360. And again, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS). It has been an honor to serve with you and to share this time with you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. (Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember that the 4 men suspected of the bombing, Bobby Frank Cherry, Herman Cash, Thomas Blanton, and Robert Chambliss, were not immediately prosecuted because authorities believed it impossible to obtain a conviction in the heated racial climate of the mid-1960s. Alabama Attorney General Bill Baxley successfully prosecuted Robert Chambliss 13 years after the bombing. After the indictment and conviction of Robert Chambliss the bombing investigation was closed. The investigation was reopened in 1995 due to the efforts of Federal Bureau of Investigation Special Agent

Rob Langford and local African-American leaders. In 2001 and 2002 a joint Federal and State task force, under the supervision of United States Attorney Douglas Jones and Alabama Attorney General William Pryor, successfully prosecuted Thomas Blanton and Bobby Frank Cherry with the assistance of State and local law enforcement personnel. We in Alabama and the Nation Owe a Debt of Gratitude for the tireless efforts of then Attorney General Bill Baxley, FBI Special Agent Rob Langford, Local African-American leaders, United States Attorney Douglas Jones, and Alabama Attorney General William Pryor as well as those state and local law enforcement personnel who brought these perpetrators to justice.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a supporter of today's legislation that would award a Congressional Gold Medal to commemorate the lives of Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robinson and Cynthia Wesley.

This year we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the atrocious bombing of the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama that killed these four little girls on their way to Sunday School. While nothing can bring these innocent victims back, today we honor their legacy with this bill to award them Congressional Gold Medals.

Earlier this year I attended the anniversary of Freedom March in Selma. It was a moving experience. The stories of the struggle for civil rights remind us to continue to fight for the rights and freedoms of all Americans. Today we take another step forward by honoring these four innocent girls who lost their lives on that fateful day, 50 years ago.

□ 1340

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 360, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1549, HELPING SICK AMERICANS NOW ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 175 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 175

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1549) to amend Public Law 111-148 to transfer fiscal year 2013 through fiscal year 2016 funds from the Pre-

vention and Public Health Fund to carry out the temporary high risk health insurance pool program for individuals with pre-existing conditions, and to extend access to such program to such individuals who have had creditable coverage during the 6 months prior to application for coverage through such program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-8. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

House Resolution 175 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 1549. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The rule makes in order two amendments, one Republican, one Democratic, with 10 minutes of debate for each. Further, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bill. The underlying legislation is a needed piece of relief for the hundreds of thousands of Americans who were promised by their President that they would be covered under the Affordable Care Act's Preexisting Condition Insurance Plan and then were told, as of February 1 of this year, Sorry, we're closed. This is one of the many promises the President made that he has failed to uphold.

In response to the President's failed promise, Chairman JOE PITTS introduced H.R. 1549, the Helping Sick Americans Act, to continue to provide insurance for those Americans who are most in need of immediate care. And to pay to give those most vulnerable patients insurance and care, we use the Prevention and Public Health Fund, an allocation of money that should be going to help patients, but it's instead being used for administrative costs to set up the exchanges that won't be online for some time now and for glossy brochures to extol their virtues. The money could be used to help people now, and that's why Republicans are here today.

The Affordable Care Act created the new Preexisting Condition Insurance Plan, which was, arguably, duplicative of actions taken by 35 States prior to 2010 that were operating risk pools, that were operating re-insurance programs and served over 200,000 Americans.

It has been shown that State-based programs play an important role in lowering costs across markets and then providing coverage options for those with preexisting conditions. In some States, those plans merged with the Federal plan into an existing high-risk pool. In other States, like Texas, the Federal plan operates in parallel to the State's pool.

But whether the States merged their pools, adopted a State-administered preexisting plan, or whether the Federal preexisting plan is the only option, this program is the only answer for those who have found themselves unable to purchase insurance on their own because of a medical condition.

Shortly after the passage of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, the chief actuary for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services estimated that the creation of this program would result in roughly 375,000 gaining coverage in 2010. However, to date, only 107,000 individuals were enrolled in the program as of January 1 of this year.

On February 15 of this year, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services announced to States that the agency was suspending enrollment in the Preexisting Condition Insurance Program. Very little was said of the fact that

this program was intended to help individuals with preexisting conditions through the 1st of January of 2014.

Despite lower than expected enrollment, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services announced that it will no longer enroll new individuals in the program, and it will bar States from accepting new applications because of their financial constraints.

According to a report from The Washington Post:

Tens of thousands of Americans who cannot get health insurance because of preexisting medical problems will be blocked from the program that was actually designed to help them.

On March 5, along with Republican leadership and the leadership from the Energy and Commerce Committee, we wrote to the President. We let him know that this was not right. We let him know that, while we may have designed the preexisting pool differently, Republicans have supported risk pools, and that he could easily use funds from other accounts in the Affordable Care Act like the Prevention and Public Health Fund. But so far, the response to our letter from the President is zero.

I support prevention activities. As a doctor, I know it's better to keep a person well than to treat an illness; and to anyone across the aisle, we've demonstrated this in the past. If we want to modernize government programs where they have fallen behind private insurers and employers in avoiding disease and getting people more involved in their health care, we're here to talk.

□ 1350

But the prevention fund has been used in a haphazard way, with no unified vision and in many ways that are quite questionable, with the mere hope, with the mere aspiration that 10 years from now we can look back and think that we've made a difference. But it's really something I cannot support when we are \$17 trillion in debt and sick Americans are being turned away from an insurance coverage that they were promised by the President.

As a physician, ensuring those with preexisting conditions have access to quality and affordable health insurance is a priority. As much as I believe that the Affordable Care Act stretched the bounds of constitutionality—and I still do—I was concerned that if the Supreme Court had invalidated the law last summer, those who were in this new Federal preexisting pool would have had the rug pulled out from under them and they could have been barred from merging into their States' pool because of the previously provided coverage.

That's why, to ensure that that did not happen, I was prepared to answer that challenge, had it arisen, by introducing legislation prior to the Court's decision to provide States with the financial backing to decide how best to provide coverage for this population through some type of risk pool, reinsurance, or other innovative method.

I will also note that unlike many of the complaints that the Preexisting Condition Insurance Program has faced, that bill, as well as the bill that we are considering today, did not require those with preexisting conditions to jump through hoops or to remain uninsured for 6 months before being eligible for coverage. On the other hand, instead of making sick Americans a priority, the administration is telling them to just give us 10 more months. Well, what a striking comparison.

There are always stories of those who have done the right thing and insured themselves and then, for whatever reason—falling on bad luck or hard times—have fallen out of the system, usually because of a job loss, they get a medical diagnosis, and when their employment status changes, they find themselves forever locked out of coverage. Those were the stories that people thought of when they did say they wanted something done about this issue.

I might add that when the Affordable Care Act was passed, the administration and congressional Democrats vastly oversold this concept. We were told time and again there were 8 to 12 to 15 million people wandering the country with some type of preexisting condition that were excluded from coverage. It's interesting that now, here we are 3 years later, spending \$5 billion and they've enrolled a hundred thousand people in the program. But it's a hundred thousand people with a very compelling story.

We were told by the American people they wanted us to fix this problem, they didn't want us to screw up the rest of the country's health care, and they wanted some help on cost. But, unfortunately, we failed on every one of those counts.

Since the administration has cut off enrollment, how many people have signed into or aged into the 6-month exclusion that would otherwise be able to sign up? The fact is we don't know. But we had a hearing 4 weeks ago where we heard from some of these people. They do have compelling stories. How many were awaiting coverage but are now told, especially in States where the Federal preexisting program is the only option, you just wait until 2014. So do the best you can with what you've got between now and then.

I will admit that many of the current State-based programs are underfunded and lacking the ability to meet their needs. It is costly to deal with this population of patients. I was prepared in the bill that I offered last summer to authorize \$30 billion to provide coverage. House Republicans supported \$25 billion in our substitute to the Affordable Care Act back in November of 2009.

H.R. 1549 will redirect \$3.5 billion from the Prevention and Public Health Fund and then eliminate the fund in 2016. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that, unlike the authors of the Affordable Care Act, we have provided enough funding to meet the needs

of the program through the end of the year, while ultimately reducing the deficit. Furthermore, once the “train wreck” of failed implementation occurs, the amendment that Mr. PITTS plans to offer would provide an escape valve for Americans with a preexisting condition by providing States with a block grant to fund State high-risk pools.

The majority is serious about funding these programs and dealing with the issue, and those cost are a drop in the bucket as to what the Affordable Care Act will cost our country in the future. But those efforts recognize that for those who do need insurance and are truly uninsurable in the market, it will be costly but we will make the decisions that set our priorities straight.

Where the President’s response was to tell the people tough luck, not to prepare for needing more money or transfer funds out of other parts of the Affordable Care Act or to look for efficiencies or mismanagement in the preexisting condition program or even approach Congress for funding, dead silence from the administration. Well, here Republicans will lead and ensure that we help sick Americans now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We begin this week the way we’ve begun every week since January: spinning our wheels.

As we speak, sequestration is hitting communities across our country. Flight delays have started, Head Start programs are turning away children, and unemployment benefits are being curtailed. Despite the calls from me and all my Democratic colleagues to stop the sequestration, the majority refuses to act. In fact, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Representative VAN HOLLEN, has come four times to the Rules Committee with an amendment that would repeal sequestration, but the majority has rejected it every single time.

The majority has also left the job of passing a budget unfinished. With budgets passed by both the Senate and the House, it is now time to finish the job, and for the majority that constantly calls for regular order and concerns itself with no Senate budget, they now refuse to appoint the conferees. And they must, if we’re going to get the budget.

Instead of taking meaningful action on these two important issues, the majority is proposing a bill that is nothing more than a political gimmick. As everyone knows, there’s no chance that the Senate will consider this bill. Even if it did, the President’s senior advisers have stated that they will recommend the President veto the bill.

In the short history of the 113th Congress, I have been repeatedly dismayed that the leadership of this Chamber has refused to bring forth meaningful legislation that has any chance of becoming

law; and today is a telling example of the majority’s failure to lead.

In news reports earlier this morning, we were told that today’s bill, dubbed by reporters as “CantorCare,” may even be pulled before it gets a vote. One Member of the majority was purported to say that today’s bill does nothing but shift money from a program he doesn’t support to another program he doesn’t support. And, indeed, given the fact that not a single Republican voted for the Affordable Care Act, it seems incongruous to me that they are now here today with great bleeding-heart concerns about the people with previous conditions that keep them from being insured.

So given the multiple reports of dissent within the majority, I have to ask, If no one supports this bill, then what are we doing this afternoon except, as I pointed out earlier, what we do every week? Even if we continue to move forward on the bill, it is already clear the legislation is solely designed for political gain. For while the majority claims that they want to strengthen the Affordable Care Act, their intent is clear: they want to repeal the law.

Last week, Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius testified before the Senate Finance Committee where she was criticized by GOP Senators for using her legal authority to fund the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. As Secretary Sebelius replied in her testimony, Congress’ failure to pass a budget has forced her to take the independent action, which she’s allowed to do, in order to fund the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. It’s as simple as that. In the face of an unproductive Congress, Secretary Sebelius has done everything she can to provide the life-saving health care to the American people.

While reporting on Secretary Sebelius’ testimony, Washington Post columnist Ezra Klein explained the majority’s approach towards the Affordable Health Care Act. In part, Mr. Klein wrote:

“Insofar as the Republican Party has a strategy on ObamaCare, it goes like this: The law needs to be implemented. The GOP can try and keep the implementation from being done effectively, in part, by refusing to authorize the needed funds,” as they did in this case. I think it was \$1.5 billion.

“Then they can capitalize on the problems they create to weaken the law, or at least weaken Democrats up for reelection in 2014. In other words, step one: create problems for ObamaCare. Step two: blame ObamaCare care for the problems. Step three: political profit.”

The legislation before us is little more than a continuation of these games.

□ 1400

If the majority were making a serious attempt to expand health care coverage, they wouldn’t be funding their

proposal with money from a different program in the Affordable Care Act. Specifically, the majority wouldn’t be removing \$4 billion from the Prevention and Public Health Fund. This is a fund that is already helping States research ways to reduce instances of cancer, obesity, and heart disease.

Preventive health measures are vital to reducing the cost of health care in the United States because we know it is always cheaper to prevent disease than to treat it. In an age where more than 33 percent of our population is overweight or obese, when heart disease is the number one cause of death and the number of diabetes cases continue to grow, including children, gutting our Nation’s only Federal preventive health program is not a responsible budget decision; it is simply an underhanded attack to dismantle the Affordable Care Act one program at a time.

Finally, the majority’s newfound concern for people who are uninsured because of preexisting conditions might be more believable if they had allowed one of the numerous common-sense amendments presented to the Rules Committee to come to the floor. Among the amendments were responsible proposals to cover Americans with preexisting conditions by ending tax breaks for Big Oil, ending subsidies for owners of corporate jets, increasing taxes on cigarettes—a preventive health measure in its own right. Proposals like these would expand health care to those who need it while protecting the preventive health measures included in the Affordable Care Act. It is truly unfortunate that, in yet another restrictive process executed by the majority, these amendments were denied a vote on the House floor.

The majority and the press have made it clear that today’s bill is not a serious effort, but a political gimmick that has no chance of becoming law. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on today’s rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. I rise today in support of the rule, H.R. 1549, the Helping Sick Americans Now Act, and the Pitts amendment.

President Obama’s health care law is a train wreck. We learn more every day about its failures. H.R. 1549 addresses a problem with the law’s provision for those with preexisting conditions. The bill takes millions of dollars that the administration intends to spend on advertising its failed law and instead helps some of the sickest Americans get health insurance. Not only that, the bill will also end the ObamaCare slush fund and reduce the deficit.

H.R. 1549 is a win on all fronts. We should applaud Chairman JOE PITTS

and Congresswoman ANN WAGNER for bringing this commonsense solution forward.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, we will be doing, as I said, a previous question amendment to this rule to hold a vote on the Put America Back to Work Act, and I would like to yield now 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlelady, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the underlying bill and in opposition to this rule and for a “no” vote on the previous question so that we can substitute Mr. CONNOLLY’s bill for this bill, which will mean we will substitute something that will grow jobs from something that will waste time, not because those with preexisting conditions aren’t worthy of our consideration—and, in fact, were considered in the Affordable Care Act and will have, as of January 2014, some real protections, not just high-risk protections, some real protections for them and their families.

The previous speaker said “this train wreck.” This train wreck has already benefited millions of people: millions of seniors, millions of women, millions of people with preexisting conditions, millions of students, millions of young people who couldn’t get insurance but can stay on their family’s policy, millions of people who didn’t have their benefits capped. Millions of people have already benefited.

The Republican Party continues to oppose. They want to see this bill be a train wreck and are doing everything in their power to destroy the tracks, everything in their power to make sure it doesn’t work, make sure that hundreds of millions—yes, hundreds of millions—of Americans won’t be benefited by bringing down cost and making insurance available to millions of people.

Just like the little boy who took the lives of his two parents complained to the court, “Give me mercy because I’m an orphan,” they are destroying the tracks that have been constructed to give Americans health care assurance.

Now, let me say, if we vote against this previous question, we will have an opportunity to consider Mr. CONNOLLY’s bill. That bill will be consistent with the Make It In America agenda—job creation, not wasting time.

We’re going to do a bill on Thursday and Friday that we could do in 10 minutes—totally noncontroversial; it’s about helium. We’re going to take 2 days to do that bill; it could be done in 10 minutes. We are spinning our wheels, as the gentlelady suggested.

One bill that will be something that we can do for America and jobs as part of the Make It In America agenda is

H.R. 535, the Put America Back to Work Now Act, sponsored by my friend from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY). It would permanently extend the Build America Bonds program to help State and local governments leverage private capital to finance infrastructure projects—jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Build America Bonds have been strongly supported by mayors, city managers, county legislators, and State officials from both parties—a bipartisan support for this bill. At the local level, it is a bipartisan solution that we know works because these bonds were used effectively in 2009 and 2010 before they expired.

When it comes to making investments in our Nation’s infrastructure, we should be able to support local governments that want to attract manufacturing and invest in making their communities safer, cleaner, and more secure.

By the way, if we create these jobs, the probability is these people who get these jobs will have health insurance and will be served, as the doctor would like, as I would like—hopefully.

But let us not continue to waste time on a bill that we know has a deeply divided Republican Party—as we’re going to see on this vote, I’m sure—and will not get through the Senate and will not be signed by the President. We’re just wasting our time here—political messages.

By the way, you’ve garbled your message pretty badly, as I understand from Club for Growth and Heritage Foundation and FreedomWorks.

So vote against the previous question. Vote for building America and growing jobs.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself 1 minute.

You know, on the subject of wasting time, it was 6 or 7 weeks ago that Chairman PITTS sent a letter to the President saying: What are you proposing to do about this? This was not something that was in the plan. You promised something that was different. What are we to tell people who are now calling our committee and asking us how you’re going to respond to this?

The President chose not to respond to that letter—it’s been 6 or 7 weeks—but, boy, it didn’t take him 24 hours to turn around a Statement of Administration Policy that said they would veto this bill should it pass the House. That’s another reason for me to be for it.

But, look, in this Statement of Administration Policy, it says: The Affordable Care Act forces most insurance companies to play by the rules. Well, I think this House has an opportunity today to say to the administration: Play by the rules.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I’m pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD), a member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the ranking member for your hard work on these issues, and I stand before this House to ask that all Members reject this rule.

I had an amendment, which was not approved, which is germane to H.R. 1549 and follows CutGo and would have prevented defunding of the Prevention and Public Health Fund. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee rejected this amendment in order to keep this bill purely about political posturing.

My constituents sent me here to work together to solve problems, not to relitigate legislation which has been adopted by Congress, approved by the President, upheld by the Supreme Court, and the American people support.

□ 1410

The Prevention and Public Health Fund, among other things, helps reduce minority population health disparities and supports health care for chronic and costly conditions such as diabetes, heart disease, and cancer. There are medically underserved communities in my district and across the country that need better access to care.

My amendment would prevent siphoning of resources needed to reduce health disparities among minority populations. During the 112th Congress, the House voted repeatedly to cut this very program. Now the Rules Committee has rejected my amendment.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule. We need an open process, not more political gamesmanship that hurts the American people who need access to quality health care.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

It takes me back to when the Affordable Care Act passed this House and the tumultuous time in March of 2010. I had 18 amendments in the Rules Committee the night before that. The ranking member may remember that. None of those amendments were made in order. Look, if that’s the yardstick by which we’re going to measure, we’ve got a long way to go.

But I need to respond to something that was said by the minority whip. He referenced the Appalachian train wreck. These are not my words. These are words that were used by a senior Democratic committee chairman about this bill. And then just today, breaking news, I’m handed an article from Politico, another senior Democrat, chairman of the Health Committee over on the Senate side, is putting a hold on the administrator for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services nomination.

And why is that hold being placed? An aide said that the Senator objected because CMS was using Prevention and Public Health Funds to pay for the health law implementation; the very reason we’re here today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my dear friend from New York, the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleague to oppose the previous question so we can bring up a proven jobs bill for consideration, rather than rehash the same old critiques for the 36th time on the Affordable Care Act.

Just last week, the head of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston warned that if job creation doesn't pick up soon, we run the risk of long-term unemployment becoming a structural rather than cyclical problem within our economy. Despite more than 6 million new jobs being created in the last 4 years, the lingering effects of the Great Recession continue to be a drag on the labor market. Unemployment in the construction sector, particularly, is nearly double the national rate, with hiring down 2 million from its peak in 2006.

I have introduced the Put America Back to Work Act, H.R. 535, which would permanently reauthorize the successful Build America Bonds program at a more revenue-neutral rate. In just 2 years, that program, Madam Speaker, supported \$181 billion in community infrastructure projects in every State of the Union and created thousands of new jobs. Every dollar of Federal investment leveraged \$41 in private sector funds to help our State and local governments recover and construct the needed infrastructure throughout the country. Local governments issued more than \$275 million in new bonds, with one of the largest projects completing a missing segment of a cross-county parkway in my district that now links major employment centers.

Reauthorizing Build America Bonds is part of the President's Rebuild America Partnership initiative, and it is part of the Make It In America agenda put forth by STENY HOYER, our minority whip. More important, it has the strong support of investors, local governments, State governments, and construction companies throughout the United States. Build America Bonds helped provide 36 percent of all municipal bond sales back in 2009–2010 when, literally, municipal bonds had stopped being issued.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing the previous question so we can bring up H.R. 535. Let's do something for America, its localities, its States, its crumbling infrastructure. These investments reap large and long-term returns. Look at the interstate highway system, a gift that keeps on giving 65 years later.

Defeating the previous question will allow us to come together finally on a bipartisan basis and do something for our country. Build America Bonds is an idea whose time has arrived.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

There's nothing that has been more damaging to job creation in this country than the first 2 years of the first Obama term. During that time, with vast majorities in both the House and the Senate, the anti-employment, the outright hostility to the productive sector of American society, was palpable. People responded to that in very predictable ways, so they hunkered down.

And then you come throw the wet blanket of the Affordable Care Act. What did that do to job creation? It killed it in this country, and it is killing it today.

If you want job creation in this country, you will provide some stability, some sanity, to allow those people who are still in that hunkered-down modality that they've been in since the first Obama administration was sworn in, allow them a chance for real economic recovery. That's why it's important to divert those funds from the Prevention and Public Health Fund, help those people with preexisting conditions, and, yes, we may get some sanity out of the administration on the implementation of the health care law if we do that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of defeating the previous question. Putting people back to work is our number one priority.

Mr. CONNOLLY's bill, which is part of the Make It In America agenda, will strengthen our economy by creating jobs and spurring innovation throughout the American manufacturing sector.

One area where we must assert world leadership is in clean energy technologies. This is why I have introduced the Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Act, legislation that is part of the Make It In America agenda. This bill will help clean energy technology companies access the world market and ensure these companies have the resources they need to export their products. Let's face it, the clean energy technology industry is growing rapidly. New jobs will be created, if not here, then in places like China and Germany.

In my home district of Sacramento, we have over 200 clean energy companies, the majority of which are small businesses. Clean World Partners is a local company that is converting everyday items like food and waste into energy. Altergy Systems manufactures fuel cell power systems. These small business owners want to expand their manufacturing operations and export their clean energy technologies to foreign markets, but they need our help, and they need it now.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and immediately take up the Connolly bill, which is part

of the Make It In America agenda, to show the American public we are serious about investing in our economy.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The last Congress we had this debate over and over again, which obviously culminated with the significant findings in our Committee on Energy and Commerce on what happened with the energy company called Solyndra. The moneys that were pushed out the door by the Department of Energy in the first 4 years of the Obama administration, those moneys were poorly spent and unwisely invested. And what did we get for that investment? More debt.

Here we are faced with a condition in the Prevention Fund where these dollars are going to be pushed out the door hiring navigators. Remember, part of the Affordable Care Act was to absolutely remove insurance agents and brokers from the environment, and now we're going to populate the environment with these navigators that are going to help sell people health insurance, and they're going to be paid for out of the Department of Health and Human Services with the prevention fund. It doesn't sound like prevention to me. I think we ought to prevent that from happening.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentlelady from New York for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question.

When I came to the Congress 4 months ago, I didn't really anticipate that we would be arguing over legislation that was passed 3 years ago. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle think it's 2010. They are spending all of their time debating bills from years past.

ObamaCare was passed by the House, passed by the Senate, and signed by the President. That means it's the law. That didn't stop conservatives. They have tried to amend, gut, defund, investigate, and sue ObamaCare into oblivion. And they failed because Americans support progress and reform.

□ 1420

But ObamaCare seems to be on their messaging calendar this week, so we're stuck with it until Friday. But what happened to last week's Republican message or to even last month's messaging?

Just ask yourself: Isn't it odd that the Republicans aren't saying that we need to pass a budget anymore?

Earlier this year, the House majority was going on and on about the need to pass a budget. For months, my colleagues asked: Why hasn't the Senate passed a budget? Why hasn't the Senate passed a budget?

Guess what? The Senate passed a budget.

So why is the House majority refusing to go to conference?

I'm sure Senator REID gets some amusement from calling Speaker BOEHNER's bluff and watching the Republican caucus squirm, but this back-and-forth is a waste of time.

Let's get past debates from 3 years ago and get on with our work. Our time is precious. The House should appoint conferees and pass a final budget and get on with addressing the real crisis our Nation faces—jobs.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself 1 minute.

Since the gentleman wasn't here in the spring of 2010 when the Affordable Care Act passed, he probably didn't hear the utterance of the then-Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, who famously, from that chair, stood up and said, "We've got to pass this law to find out what's in it."

Here we are a little over 3 years later, and we're still finding out what's in it. Yes, the law is the law—the law has passed; the law is signed—but what has happened since that time is this torrent of regulations that has come out of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of the Treasury, the Office of Personnel Management—all of those Federal agencies charged with implementing this failed product. Now, we can argue all we want about settled law being settled law, but rulemaking is going on even as we speak. New rules are coming out. New rules are being promulgated.

Look at the Essential Health Benefit Rule. Why did the administration hide the ball on that one until 2 days after election day? Because they were afraid of what the public's response would be when they saw what that rule actually said. It turns out that most of the Nation's Governors said, We don't want any part of this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as it takes me to read this message. It needs to be answered, and I want everybody in America to listen up. You've been told it's a job-killing bill and that it has caused all this grief. Let me say:

Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, the United States has added more than 6 million private sector jobs. The health care industry alone, which many opponents of the law predicted would face job-killing new regulation, has added more than 750,000 jobs.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. HAHN).

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of defeating the previous question so that the House may bring up Representative CONNOLLY's Put America Back to Work Act as part of the Make It In America legislative package.

Make It In America is a comprehensive jobs plan that aims to reinvigorate our ailing manufacturing sector and bring innovation and high-skilled, high-wage jobs back to the United States, and it invests in training the skilled workforce needed to support manufacturing in the 21st century.

We have an infrastructure crisis in this country, Madam Speaker, which is

why I introduced the Bridges to Jobs Act as part of the Make It In America package.

Do you know there are about 70,000 bridges that have been classified as "structurally deficient" in our country? Leaving these bridges in their current state of disrepair poses a grave threat not only to our safety but also to our economy. This act provides each State with \$10 million in grants to put Americans back to work by repairing our crumbling bridges. Not only will this legislation put Americans back to work and bolster our ailing economy, it will also ensure the safety of the millions who use these bridges each and every day.

I urge my colleagues to support this crucial investment in our workforce, our economy, and our safety. Let's defeat the previous question so we can bring this bill back up.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself 1 minute.

I think it's important for Members of this body to understand one of the things we're talking about today. It's section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. In my copy, it's found on page 466. This delineates the outline of the Prevention and Public Health Fund.

Section A: The purpose is to establish a Prevention and Public Health Fund.

That all sounds good. It's to be administered through the Office of the Secretary to provide for the expanded and sustained national investment in the maintaining of public health. All good as it sounds.

Then the funding section. The funding section is important because it's unlike other sections of law. Yes, it started small with literally a half billion dollars in fiscal year 2010. It escalated from there, and by next year, this fund will be up to \$2 billion a year. That's self-replenishing in perpetuity. That's until the Earth cools another time or the Second Coming. It's \$2 billion a year forever.

Now, the use of the fund is the next section. That is telling because there is broad authority for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to transfer these dollars to other areas she wants. That is what leads to the problem. That is what leads to the difficulty with this section.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has more requests for time? I have none, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. BURGESS. I will go as long as the gentlelady wants, but I guess I have no more speakers other than myself.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, at the end of my remarks I will insert in the RECORD the Democratic amendments that were disallowed last night from the Rules Committee.

In closing, Madam Speaker, we've heard a lot today, but I think probably

one of the most important things for America to know—because you hear constantly how many jobs this bill is going to be killing—is the fact that we have produced 6 million new jobs, 750,000 in health care alone.

So the most important thing we can do for Americans with preexisting conditions, which is the subject today, and for every American seeking quality and affordable health care is to support the full implementation of the Affordable Care Act. Unfortunately, the proposal put forward by the majority today is an attempt to dismantle a crucial part of that important law.

SUMMARY OF DEMOCRATIC AMENDMENTS NOT MADE IN ORDER BY THE RULES COMMITTEE FOR H.R. 1549—HELPING SICK AMERICANS NOW ACT

(SUMMARIES DERIVED FROM INFORMATION PROVIDED BY SPONSORS)

LISTED IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER—PREPARED APRIL 24, 2013

Amendment #4

Sponsor: Capps (CA)

Description: Removes the public health and prevention trust fund as a pay-for and instead pays for the bill by ending the section 199 domestic manufacturing deduction for oil and gas production.

Amendment #5

Sponsor: Green, Gene (TX)

Description: Makes the same changes to the PCIP program that the underlying bill does, but is paid for by requiring a minimum term and a remainder interest greater than zero for new Grantor Retained Annuity Trusts (GRATs)

Amendment #10

Sponsor: Horsford, Steven (NV)

Description: Requires the HHS Secretary to transfer all of the monies in the Fund for the next four fiscal years to the PCIP program except those monies from the fund that are used for reducing health disparities among minority populations.

Amendment #1

Sponsor: Pallone (NJ)

Description: Makes the same changes to the PCIP program that the underlying bill does, but is paid for through a 4 cent per pack increase in the tax on cigarettes.

Amendment #2

Sponsor: Pallone (NJ)

Description: Makes the same changes to the PCIP program that the underlying bill does, but is paid for by continuing the solvency of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund by increasing the per-barrel amount that oil companies are required to pay into the fund by four cents.

Amendment #3

Sponsor: Schakowsky (IL)

Description: Extends funding for reopening enrollment under the Preexisting Condition Insurance Program (PCIP)

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, and I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, as the gentlelady mentioned, we've heard a lot today.

I think I've said over and over again how I, unequivocally, oppose the Affordable Care Act and would like to see it forever dismantled and thrown on the dustbin of history. Guilty as charged. That is what I would like to see, but that's actually not what we're talking about today.

We're here today to talk about the President's promise to help people with preexisting conditions obtain health insurance, and it has been one of the few areas of agreement between Republicans and Democrats over the last several years. House Republicans have urged the President to work with us on a solution to this issue, but all we've heard from the White House has been silence. So, today, we are offering a solution:

The bill transfers funds from an unnecessary slush fund and, instead, prioritizes the Nation's most sick and vulnerable who have been denied coverage and who have been the victims of the Affordable Care Act's broken promises. This bill does not provide more money to government health care programs, but instead it helps those who are in desperate need have access to privately run health insurance. Instead of continuing to use the Prevention and Public Health Fund to prop up the Affordable Care Act's flailing exchanges, we would use the money allocated for public health to actually help sick Americans.

If we do not act, the administration will continue to spend this money on heaven knows what: neutering programs, pickle ball—whatever the heck that is—and programs that are rife with potential for fraud and abuse to support their own failing implementation plans. Instead of further increasing this Nation's \$17 trillion deficit, we can pass this bill that will provide health care to the sick and will reduce the deficit at the same time.

In the end, it's not about the money. It's about America's patients. The President should be embarrassed. His political bait-and-switch is not working. Instead of putting the care of the sick first, you tell them, Sorry, Sister, we're closed. Come back in 10 months.

Ten months, a week, a day may be the amount of time some of these patients have to get treatment or else face the consequences of the progression of their illnesses.

□ 1430

America's doctors and hospitals will be there, and they'll always be there. But why deny them the means to get their services paid for with insurance coverage?

Mr. President, your health bill fails this country, and, most importantly, you have failed the thousands of sick Americans who can't get health coverage because you think implementing the health care law is more important

than taking care of the people who you promised to take care of.

So today we can end the use of the slush fund and use it to actually help people. A vote for this bill is a vote to help sick Americans now.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and support the passage of H.R. 1549.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 175 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 535) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the Build America Bonds program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 535.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to

yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BURGESS. With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 175, if ordered, and motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 360.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 192, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—228

Aderholt	Bentivolio	Brooks (IN)
Alexander	Bilirakis	Brown (GA)
Amash	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan
Amodei	Black	Bucshon
Bachmann	Blackburn	Burgess
Bachus	Bonner	Calvert
Barletta	Boustany	Camp
Barr	Brady (TX)	Campbell
Barton	Bridenstine	Cantor
Benishek	Brooks (AL)	Capito

Carter	Hurt	Reichert	Kennedy	Moran	Schneider	Hall	McKinley	Royce
Cassidy	Issa	Renacci	Kildee	Murphy (FL)	Schrader	Hanna	McMorris	Runyan
Chabot	Jenkins	Ribble	Kilmer	Nadler	Schwartz	Harper	Rodgers	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)	Kind	Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Harris	Meadows	Scalise
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Rigell	Kirkpatrick	Neal	Scott, David	Hartzler	Meehan	Schock
Coffman	Jones	Roby	Kuster	Negrete McLeod	Serrano	Hastings (WA)	Messer	Schweikert
Cole	Jordan	Roe (TN)	Langevin	Nolan	Sewell (AL)	Heck (NV)	Mica	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Joyce	Rogers (AL)	Larsen (WA)	O'Rourke	Shea-Porter	Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)	Larson (CT)	Owens	Sherman	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)	Sessions
Conaway	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)	Lee (CA)	Pallone	Sinema	Holding	Miller, Gary	Shimkus
Cotton	King (NY)	Rohrabacher	Levin	Pascrell	Sires	Hudson	Mullin	Shuster
Cramer	Kingston	Rokita	Lewis	Pastor (AZ)	Slaughter	Huelskamp	Mulvaney	Simpson
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Rooney	Lipinski	Payne	Smith (WA)	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen	Loebsack	Pelosi	Speier	Hultgren	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)
Daines	Labrador	Roskam	Lofgren	Perlmuter	Swalwell (CA)	Hunter	Noem	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Ross	Lowenthal	Peters (CA)	Takano	Hurt	Nugent	Stewart
Denham	Lamborn	Rothfus	Lowe	Peters (MI)	Thompson (CA)	Issa	Nunes	Stivers
Dent	Lance	Royce	Lujan Grisham	Peterson	Thompson (MS)	Jenkins	Nunnelee	Stockman
DeSantis	Lankford	Runyan	(NM)	Pingree (ME)	Titus	Johnson (OH)	Olson	Stutzman
DesJarlais	Latham	Ryan (WI)	Luján, Ben Ray	Pocan	Tonko	Johnson, Sam	Palazzo	Terry
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Salmon	(NM)	Price (NC)	Tsongas	Jones	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	LoBiondo	Maffei	Maloney, Carolyn	Quigley	Van Hollen	Jordan	Pearce	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	Long	Maloney, Sean	McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Vargas	Joyce	Perry	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Matsui	McDermott	Rangel	Vela	Kelly (PA)	Petri	Tipton
Ellmers	Luetkemeyer	McGovern	McIntyre	Richmond	Velázquez	King (IA)	Pittenger	Turner
Farenthold	Lummis	McHenry	McNeerney	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky	King (NY)	Pitts	Upton
Fincher	Marchant	Stewart	Meeks	Rush	Walz	Kingston	Poe (TX)	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Walberg	Meng	Ruppersberger	Wasserman	Kinzinger (IL)	Pompeo	Wagner
Fleischmann	Massie	Walden	Michaud	Ryan (OH)	Schultz	Kline	Posay	Walberg
Fleming	Matheson	Walorski	Moore	Sánchez, Linda T.	Waters	Labrador	Price (GA)	Walden
Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Weber (TX)	Cook	Sanchez, Loretta	Watt	LaMalfa	Radel	Walorski
Fortenberry	McCauley	Webster (FL)	Culberson	Sarbanes	Waxman	Lamborn	Reed	Weber (TX)
Fox	McClintock	Wenstrup	Dingell	Schakowsky	Welch	Lance	Reichert	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Westmoreland	Flores	Schiff	Wilson (FL)	Lankford	Renacci	Webster (FL)
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Williams			Yarmuth	Latham	Ribble	Wenstrup
Gardner	McMorris	Wittman				Latta	Rice (SC)	Westmoreland
Garrett	Rodgers	Wolf				LoBiondo	Rigell	Whitfield
Gerlach	Meadows	Womack				Long	Roby	Williams
Gibbs	Gibson	Yoder				Lucas	Roe (TN)	Wilson (SC)
Gingrey (GA)	Meehan	Yoho				Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Wittman
Gohmert	Messer	Young (AK)				Lummis	Rogers (KY)	Wolf
Goodlatte	Mica	Young (FL)				Marchant	Rogers (MI)	Womack
Gosar	Miller (FL)	Young (IN)				Marino	Rohrabacher	Woodall
Gosar	Miller (MI)					Massie	Rokita	Yoder
Gowdy	Miller, Gary					McCarthy (CA)	Rooney	Yoho
Granger	Mullin					McCauley	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
Graves (GA)	Mulvaney					McClintock	Roskam	Young (FL)
Graves (MO)	Murphy (PA)					McHenry	Rothfus	Young (IN)
Griffin (AR)	Neugebauer					McKeon		
Griffith (VA)	Noem							
Grimm	Nugent							
Guthrie	Nunes							
Hall	Nunnelee							
Hanna	Olson							
Harper	Palazzo							
Harris	Paulsen							
Hartzler	Pearce							
Hastings (WA)	Perry							
Heck (NV)	Petri							
Hensarling	Pittenger							
Herrera Beutler	Pitts							
Holding	Poe (TX)							
Hudson	Pompeo							
Huelskamp	Posay							
Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)							
Hultgren	Radel							
Hunter	Reed							

NAYS—192

Andrews	Clyburn	Frankel (FL)
Barber	Cohen	Fudge
Barrow (GA)	Connolly	Gabbard
Bass	Conyers	Gallego
Beatty	Cooper	Garamendi
Becerra	Costa	Garcia
Bera (CA)	Courtney	Grayson
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Green, Al
Bishop (NY)	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Cummings	Grijalva
Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Gutierrez
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Hahn
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Hanabusa
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Hastings (FL)
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Heck (WA)
Bustos	DeLauro	Higgins
Butterfield	DelBene	Himes
Capps	Deutch	Holt
Capuano	Doggett	Honda
Cárdenas	Doyle	Horsford
Carney	Duckworth	Hoyer
Carson (IN)	Edwards	Huffman
Cartwright	Ellison	Israel
Castor (FL)	Engel	Jackson Lee
Castro (TX)	Enyart	Jeffries
Chu	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Cicilline	Esty	Johnson, E. B.
Clarke	Farr	Kaptur
Clay	Fattah	Keating
Cleaver	Foster	Kelly (IL)

NOT VOTING—12

□ 1458

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. FATTAH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 189, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—225

Aderholt	Campbell	Farenthold
Alexander	Cantor	Fincher
Amash	Capito	Fitzpatrick
Amodei	Cassidy	Fleischmann
Bachmann	Chabot	Fleming
Bachus	Chaffetz	Forbes
Barletta	Coble	Fortenberry
Barr	Coffman	Fox
Barton	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Benish	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Bentivolio	Collins (NY)	Gardner
Bilirakis	Conaway	Garrett
Bishop (UT)	Cotton	Gerlach
Black	Cramer	Gibbs
Blackburn	Crawford	Gibson
Bonner	Crenshaw	Gingrey (GA)
Boustany	Daines	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Goodlatte
Bridenstine	Denham	Gosar
Brooks (AL)	Dent	Gowdy
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Granger
Broun (GA)	DesJarlais	Graves (GA)
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Graves (MO)
Bucshon	Duffy	Griffin (AR)
Burgess	Duncan (SC)	Griffith (VA)
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Grimm
Camp	Ellmers	Guthrie
		Hinojosa
		Lynch
		Markey
		Miller, George
		Polis
		Smith (NE)
		Tierney
		Veasey

NAYS—189

Andrews	Doyle	Larsen (WA)
Barber	Duckworth	Larson (CT)
Barrow (GA)	Edwards	Lee (CA)
Beatty	Ellison	Levin
Becerra	Engel	Lewis
Bera (CA)	Enyart	Lipinski
Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	Loebsack
Bishop (NY)	Esty	Lofgren
Blumenauer	Farr	Lowenthal
Bonamici	Fattah	Lowe
Brady (PA)	Foster	Lujan Grisham
Braley (IA)	Frankel (FL)	(NM)
Brown (FL)	Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray
Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	(NM)
Bustos	Gallego	Maffei
Butterfield	Garamendi	Maloney
Capps	Garcia	Carolyn
Capuano	Grayson	Maloney, Sean
Cárdenas	Green, Al	Matheson
Carney	Green, Gene	Matsui
Carson (IN)	Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)
Cartwright	Gutierrez	McCollum
Castor (FL)	Hahn	McDermott
Castro (TX)	Hanabusa	McGovern
Chu	Hastings (FL)	McIntyre
Cicilline	Heck (WA)	McNeerney
Clarke	Higgins	Meeks
Clay	Himes	Michaud
Cleaver	Holt	Moore
Clyburn	Honda	Moran
Cohen	Horsford	Murphy (FL)
Connolly	Hoyer	Nadler
Conyers	Huffman	Napolitano
Cooper	Israel	Neal
Costa	Jackson Lee	Negrete McLeod
Courtney	Jeffries	Nolan
Crowley	Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Cummings	Kaptur	Pallone
Davis (CA)	Keating	Pascrell
Davis, Danny	Kelly (IL)	Pastor (AZ)
DeFazio	Kennedy	Payne
DeGette	Kildee	Pelosi
Delaney	Kilmer	Perlmuter
DeLauro	Kind	Peters (CA)
DelBene	Kirkpatrick	Peters (MI)
Deutch	Kuster	Peterson
Doggett	Langevin	Pingree (ME)

Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider

Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Bass
Carter
Cook
Culberson
Dingell
Flores

Hinojosa
Lynch
Markey
Meng
Miller, George
Polis

Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Smith (NE)
Tierney
Veasey
Yarmuth

□ 1505

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO ADDIE MAE COLLINS, DENISE McNAIR, CAROLE ROBERTSON, AND CYNTHIA WESLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 360) to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley to commemorate the lives they lost 50 years ago in the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church, where these 4 little Black girls' ultimate sacrifice served as a catalyst for the Civil Rights Movement, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—420

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishok
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black

Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor

Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole

Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins

Himes
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Neal
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebback
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaull
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)

Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson

Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi

Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt

Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Cook
Dingell
Flores
Hinojosa

Lynch
Markey
Miller, George
Polis

Smith (NE)
Tierney
Veasey
Walorski

□ 1514

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COOK. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 121 on the ordering of the previous question for H. Res. 175, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 122 on adoption of H. Res. 175, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1549, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 123 on final passage of H.R. 360, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2013, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HER EXCELLENCY PARK GEUN-HYE, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, May 8, 2013, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in Joint Meeting Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL LEGISLATION IN HONOR OF VICTIMS OF SIXTEENTH STREET BAPTIST CHURCH BOMBING PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

(Ms. SEWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SEWELL. Madam Speaker, today I just want to thank this body for passing this profound Congressional Gold

Medal in honor of the four little girls who lost their lives in the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church. I just want to acknowledge my sincere appreciation to the leadership of both parties in getting this Congressional Gold Medal on the floor.

We have in our presence two sisters of two of the deceased four little girls. I think I speak on behalf of the whole State of Alabama and our Alabama delegation when I say a profound thank you for this body. I know that everyone here is mighty appreciative of the sacrifices that their families have made in order for our great Nation to live up to its true ideals of justice and equality for all, and I think that it's befitting if we all stand and clap.

A unanimous vote is truly a victory for all of us.

TAX CODE LIBERATION DAY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, the case for tax reform was never made more clear when Americans recently struggled to fill out their increasingly complicated income tax forms. What we really need now is Tax Code Liberation Day.

Our convoluted Tax Code has become a major obstacle to individual freedom, which must be removed as soon as possible. It prevents small businesses from hiring more workers in what is now a nearly dead economic recovery.

The burden of preparing your taxes is now nearly as onerous as actually paying for the taxes. It takes 13 hours for the average American to prepare his or her taxes. The Tax Code remains almost 4 million words, many of which are incomprehensible.

We must all work together to free small businesses and individuals of the most complex regulation of them all—the Federal Income Tax Code.

KERMIT GOSNELL MURDER TRIAL

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with several of my pro-life colleagues, to bring attention to the ongoing trial of Kermit Gosnell, an abortionist from Philadelphia. Gosnell is accused of murdering, in the third degree, a woman who died during an abortion at his clinic, and first degree murder of four infants who survived abortions and were born alive, only to have their spinal cords severed by a pair of scissors.

In the words of the grand jury report:

Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies: he killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it "ensuring fetal demise."

I'm horrified by the lack of respect this doctor has for human life, and I'm

appalled by the minimal media coverage of the Gosnell trial. I'm hopeful that the disturbing images revealed by this trial will raise awareness of the gruesome practices of the abortion industry and help to prevent the tragic ending of human life that occurs every day at abortion clinics across this country.

HELPING SICK AMERICANS NOW ACT

(Mr. MCKINLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Helping Sick Americans Now Act.

I cosponsored this legislation because it addresses something that is particularly important to Republicans and Democrats alike: providing care for those who need it most.

I strongly opposed ObamaCare and have supported the efforts to repeal it; however, it's the law of the land. In it, the President and Congress made a promise to help Americans with pre-existing conditions. The President has broken this promise when he consciously cut off access to the program dealing with preexisting conditions and left tens of thousands of Americans with nowhere to turn for their health care. To many Americans, this is typical of Washington: empty gestures and broken promises. This has to stop.

We have a chance to help people get the care they were promised by taking money from a wasteful slush fund. I intend to uphold the promise the President once made and now has broken. I urge my colleagues to do the same and vote for this commonsense legislation.

□ 1520

HELPING SICK AMERICANS NOW ACT

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the House will begin discussing in the next day the legislation called Helping Sick Americans Now Act, and I would only offer a counter to that that it seems a sick way to try and help those who are in need.

This bill will deplete the healthy preventive care funding that impacts the Centers for Disease Control, that impacts the federally qualified health clinics that are all throughout our community, and it only provides funding for the sickest of Americans up until December 2013. Why don't we encourage the Governors, like Governor Perry of Texas, to accept expanded Medicaid to help heal 6 million and provide health care for 6 million uninsured in Texas, the highest number of uninsured in any State.

This is a temporary fix that is not necessary. We have the Affordable Care Act that is being implemented; and, as

we speak, millions of Americans are being covered. This is the wrong way, misdirected, and I might say it is a sick way of trying to help the sickest of Americans.

I oppose the bill.

NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-20)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, Veterans' Affairs, Armed Services, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Financial Services, Homeland Security, Oversight and Government Reform, Ways and Means, Foreign Affairs, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Intelligence (Permanent Select) and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am please to transmit the 2013 *National Drug Control Strategy*, my Administration's blueprint for reducing drug use and its consequences in the United States. As detailed in the pages that follow, my Administration remains committed to a balanced public health and public safety approach to drug policy. This approach is based on science, not ideology—and scientific research suggests that we have made real progress.

The rate of current cocaine use in the United States has dropped by 50 percent since 2006, and methamphetamine use has declined by one-third. New data released this year suggest that we are turning a corner in our efforts to address the epidemic of prescription drug abuse, with the number of people abusing prescription drugs decreasing by nearly 13 percent—from 7 million in 2010 to 6.1 million in 2011. And the number of Americans reporting that they drove after using illicit drugs also dropped by 12 percent between 2010 and 2011.

While this progress is encouraging, we must sustain our commitment to preventing drug use before it starts—the most cost-effective way to address the drug problem. The importance of prevention is becoming ever more apparent. Despite positive trends in other areas, we continue to see elevated rates of marijuana use among young people, likely driven by declines in perceptions of risk. We must continue to get the facts out about the health risks of drug use and support the positive influences in young people's lives that help them avoid risky behaviors.

The *Strategy* that follows presents a sophisticated approach to a complicated problem, encompassing prevention, early intervention, treatment, recovery support, criminal justice reform, effective law enforcement, and international cooperation.

I look forward to working with the Congress and stakeholders at all levels

in advancing this 21st century approach to drug policy.

BARACK OBAMA,
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 24, 2013.

HELPING SICK AMERICANS NOW ACT

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to begin our discussion with H.R. 1549, which will be up tomorrow, Helping Sick Americans Now Act.

I am not supporting this bill because the bill's proposals are counterintuitive to the anticipated outcome of the Prevention and Public Health Fund. This legislation strips 4 years of funding from the prevention fund to pay for a very short extension of a new enrollment in the preexisting condition insurance plan.

Further, the bill insists on a partisan offset that effectively eliminates the Prevention and Public Health Fund through 2016 to, instead, reopen the Federal High-Risk Pool Program provided by the Affordable Care Act through the end of the year.

While I support reopening the high-risk pool, I cannot support how this bill goes about creating the funding.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it's good to be in the people's House this afternoon to talk about a topic that is of utmost concern to the American people—energy. What does it mean for America? We all put gas in our cars, we all heat and cool our homes, businesses across this country power their manufacturing processes. So what does energy mean for today and for the future of our country?

I'm proud to be a member of the House Energy Action Team because we understand the critical role that domestic-energy production plays not only today, but in the future of our country. Let me give an example of why this is so important.

I remember one of the very first memorable events that occurred in March of 2011 in my first term. We were addressed here in this Chamber by the

Prime Minister of Australia. And in her remarks she commented, she said: "I remember being a young girl, sitting on the floor of my living room, watching Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin land on the Moon." She went on to talk about how America and Australia had stood side by side, how America had actually stood in front of and protected Australia during some of the darkest days of World War II in the Pacific.

□ 1530

At the end of her speech, she said, "Back when I was a little girl and when I saw that Moon landing, I thought to myself, wow, those Americans can do anything." She wrapped up her comments by saying, "Today, as Prime Minister of Australia, with a lot of experience under my belt, I still believe that Americans can do anything."

When you stop and think about the Moon landing—and I know you're going to say, Well, what does that have to do with energy? I'm getting to that. President Kennedy gave us a vision of putting a man on the Moon in 10 years. We didn't make it in 10 years. We made it in less than 10 years. The reason that we did was that every fabric of our society bought into the idea—academic institutions, the scientific community. Industries cropped up overnight. Millions of jobs were created. Young people lined up to get into academic programs in which they could major in degrees that would prepare them for careers in space exploration.

At the end of the day—actually, we're not at the end of the day—we're still benefiting from the innovation and the technological advance that came out of that era. It was a time when America's imagination was captivated by what many thought was impossible and by what the rest of the world didn't really think we could do. You look at what has happened since we started that journey—at all of the technological innovations that have occurred: cell phones, flat-screen TVs, GPS, even arthroscopic surgery. We had to learn to perform medical procedures on space travelers in a way that was noninvasive, and medical experts began to think about "how do we do that in outer space?" So we learned how to dream, and that goal to put a man on the Moon captivated America's imagination.

I want you to think for a second about what would happen if America once again embarked on a journey of that magnitude. I believe a journey to become energy independent and secure in America is just such a journey that we could embark on. A vision of energy independence and security would not only captivate the imagination of the American people but it would put America back to work at a time when our economy is in such desperate need of private-sector economic growth. Imagine what would happen if we had a national energy vision that sounded something like this:

We're going to go after the vast volumes of oil and natural gas that we have. In many experts' opinions, we've got more of it than anyone else has in the world. We're going to expand our nuclear footprint because nuclear energy is one of the safest, most reliable forms of energy on the planet. We brought that to the world, and we know how to do it. We're going to continue to mine coal, and we're going to learn how to use it environmentally soundly because we've got enough coal to fuel our energy needs for generations yet to come.

We're even going to embrace alternative forms of energy—biofuels, wind and solar. Now, they're not going to meet our heavy lifting energy needs for the foreseeable future, but there is a role that they play in our overall energy profile. We're going to back that up with action with the regulatory community and tell the regulators at the EPA and the Department of the Interior and at the Army Corps of Engineers: effective today, you start being partners in progress with America's energy industries. Rather than being the department of "no," learn how to find a way forward. If a particular project or if a particular technology presents concerns, then let's address those concerns, but "no" should not be the final answer.

We've learned through the lessons of putting a man on the Moon that, when Americans are allowed to dream, when they're allowed to innovate, when they're allowed to compete, there is nothing that we can't solve.

Why is energy independence and security so important? First of all, it's important because of national security. Right now, today, we are beholden to some countries that don't like us very much for our energy resources. Why do we want to continue to do that when we have the resources right here at home to be able to solve that problem?

In order to captivate the imagination of the American people, we've got to help the American people understand why this is so important to them. We talk about energy in terms of very important projects like the Keystone XL pipeline of which the President, himself, said that the environmental concerns were overexaggerated, so let's get the project approved.

Yet we talk about it in technical terms—pipelines, hydraulic fracturing, oil rigs, nuclear reactors, uranium enrichment. What does all of that mean to American taxpayers—to working Americans who are just struggling day in and day out to make ends meet?

Here is what it means:

Take a manufacturing process, the manufacturing of cereal, Pop-Tarts—you name it, whatever our children consume today. When domestic energy costs are reduced, those manufacturing costs to produce those goods are also reduced. When the price of diesel fuel goes down and when the cost of the transportation to transport those goods from the manufacturers to the

grocery stores goes down, those savings are passed on in the costs of the products to the consumers. When working mothers and single moms and single dads who are trying to make ends meet—who are trying to figure out how they're going to put kids through college, how they're going to buy the next pair of tennis shoes—are balancing the checkbooks and when they see that their energy costs to heat and to cool their homes are going down and that they're paying less to fill up their cars to go back and forth to work, that translates into economic confidence to do the kinds of things that we were able to do during that remarkable period of putting a man on the Moon.

Today, we've got a lot of naysayers out there who simply don't understand how important this is, this idea of energy independence and security to the American people, and they're trying to frighten the American people.

Hydraulic fracturing, my goodness. We've been doing hydraulic fracturing in America for over 60 years, over a million such operations. A former EPA administrator, herself, acknowledged there has not been a single incident in which hydraulic fracturing has contaminated the water table. Yet the EPA is working hard to try and insert itself into a process that many, many States are already doing and are already doing very well. Take, for example, the State of Ohio where I come from. Literally, my district sits on top of the Marcellus and the Utica shales, one of the world's largest reservoirs of oil and natural gas.

□ 1540

The State of Ohio has been regulating the oil and gas industry since 1965. We're among those States that have done a lot of hydraulic fracturing, and yet again there is not one proven instance where that process has contaminated drinking water, yet you've got those that sit on the sidelines and try to frighten homeowners, try to frighten those people that live in Appalachian Ohio that their water is going to be contaminated. It's not. It's a proven process.

And just over the last 5 years, we've developed technology called horizontal hydraulic fracturing, where we can go down a mile and then go out horizontally another mile, sometimes more, and have much more of that vital resource of oil and natural gas flowing to the surface, resources that are going to move America one step closer to energy independence and security.

Mr. Speaker, we've got an opportunity to put America back in charge of our economic destiny and an energy vision that is a real all-of-the-above energy vision for this country. It's what America needs.

At this time, I'd like to yield time to my colleague from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Folks in South Carolina are concerned

about where we are with energy in this country. Energy independence is something that's on the minds of folks back home.

You know, I drive a diesel truck, and the gentleman from Ohio was talking about diesel fuel just recently. When I was at the fuel pump recently fueling my truck with diesel fuel, I was paying about \$3.85 a gallon. It dawned on me, as I watched the 18-wheelers roll by coming from the pumps where they filled up, that if we were able to really achieve American energy independence and we were able to lower the cost at the pump for America's truckers and all of America's families—but I use trucking as an example. If we could truly lower the cost of diesel fuel for America's truckers by just \$1, if we could produce enough American energy resources to lower diesel fuel from that \$3.85 a gallon that I was paying down to \$2.85 a gallon—those 18-wheelers that were rolling by I believe had 400-gallon diesel tanks.

Think about that, America. Think about if that truck or that trucking company was able to save \$400 per fill-up for that 18-wheeler, and think about the number of trucks you pass on America's interstates and highway systems. If we could save that, think about the trickle-down effect that that would have for consumer products.

We're not just talking about gasoline and diesel fuel. The American hydrocarbons that are produced when they're refined, they're refined into a lot of different products. And I would ask folks to research what a barrel of hydrocarbon or fossil fuel, oil, when you put that under extreme pressure, the heat created, how it separates out and all the different products that come from a barrel of oil. It's an amazing component that God has given us.

In South Carolina, we understand that the Nation can achieve American energy independence; but we also understand that if we can't have American energy independence, why not an all-American energy strategy where we work with our neighbors to the north, our largest and best trading partner, the Canadians, or we work with the Mexicans and the folks to the south with a transboundary agreement; allow that area where the boundary between Mexico and the United States is, that we can drill in that area and we have an agreement for revenue sharing on the oil produced there.

But let's go back to our neighbors in the north, our largest and best trading partner. The former speaker of the house from South Carolina, David Wilkins, was Ambassador to Canada under the Bush administration. I spent a lot of time with Speaker Wilkins, Ambassador Wilkins, and we talked about Canada and we talked about the oil sands. This was before the Keystone XL pipeline.

But let's focus on the Keystone XL pipeline to bring that Canadian oil to American refineries that are sitting there with the capacity to refine that

Canadian oil. What do I mean by capacity? It's idle capacity. It's capacity that could be utilized to refine American resources or Canadian resources coming down to those refineries, refining that into the products that we enjoy as America.

That's why the Keystone XL pipeline is so important. Let's put Americans to work. We hear a lot about job creation and putting Americans to work. Well, this truly would. Mr. Speaker, this Keystone XL pipeline would put Americans to work in those refineries, refining that oil into all the chemicals and gasoline products and everything that we use out of a barrel of hydrocarbons or a barrel of oil. The Keystone pipeline is something that should happen in this country.

The opponents on the other side say: Well, that oil is just going to flow from Canada. It's going to flow through the United States. It's going to go to our refineries. But those contracts have been let, and that oil and those gasoline products are going to be used in other markets. It will not do anything to affect the price at the pump here.

That's what the other side says.

Here's a simple economic example:

It's supply and demand. Global demand is high right now, and the supply is low. The supply is low for a lot of reasons: the OPEC cartel and other things. Policies, moratoriums, and other things from this administration keep global supply down.

Let's assume that the oil from Canada does flow through the United States, refined at our refineries, and does flow out of this country. So what? That increased supply will meet the increased demand. And by meeting that demand, that will drive the price down, not only for Americans, but for everyone across the globe.

It's the right thing to do to put Americans to work to refine that oil into those products at American refineries. It's true job creation.

While we're on the subject of job creation, Mr. Speaker, and the gentleman that's heading up the House Energy Action Team, which is focused on an all-American energy strategy and American energy independence, while we're talking about job creation, let's talk about my State of South Carolina.

We've been excluded in the next 5-year plan, the plan that would allow offshore drilling off our coast on the Outer Continental Shelf. Right now, folks, the whole Atlantic shelf is off limits to drilling, with the exception of a very proactive State of Virginia, which has been able to include Virginia's offshore area in the next 5-year plan. We'll see if that comes to fruition.

But South Carolina is sitting there saying, with a lot of the other Atlantic States, We believe we have some resources off our coast. We believe there's natural gas off the coast of South Carolina. Let's allow South Carolina's offshore area to be included in the next 5-year plan.

What does that mean? Does that mean we're going to rush right out there and punch a hole in the Earth and start producing? Maybe; maybe not. What it does mean is that it allows that exploration. It allows those energy companies to say: You know what? That area is going to be opened up. We haven't explored out there in 30 years. It was 30-year-old technology when we went out there before. Let's go out there with new technology. Let's find out what sort of resources might be off the coast of South Carolina on the Outer Continental Shelf of the Atlantic seaboard. Let's go out there. Let's find out what might be there, and let's start producing that.

You know what happens when we do start producing? I just ask you to drive down to Louisiana and get on Highway 90 from Lafayette down to New Iberia and down to Houma and Thibodaux and those areas. You get on that four-lane highway, Mr. JOHNSON, and you ride down that highway, on both sides of the four-lane highway, business after business after business after business—and I could go on and on. These are businesses that aren't out there actually doing the drilling because those lease sales were to ExxonMobil or Halliburton or some of those companies. These are the service companies that are servicing offshore drilling.

Think about this for a minute. Think about the guys that are using the barges and the offshore boats that carry the service boats that are taking the drilling mud and the casing and the piping and the diesel fuel for the generators and the food and the personnel and everything else that goes offshore out to the platform. Then think about this: they're companies on shore. They're running trucks up and down the road that need truck repair; they need body repair. We need pipe welders and pipe fitters.

Like I said, business after business after business there in Louisiana is helping the offshore industry.

□ 1550

And South Carolina is sitting there going, Well, you know what? If we allowed drilling offshore and we allowed this to happen on the Outer Continental Shelf, then maybe those businesses would come to South Carolina—the service boats, the drilling mud, the providers of the onshore pipe fitters and pipe boilers. And you know what? Those guys have to eat. And so they fill up the local restaurants and they shop at the local Piggly Wiggly. And guess what. They give to the United Way and they give to the local church, and it's a trickle-down economy when you've got people working and you've got people creating businesses and providing income to an economy.

When we think about an all-American, energy-independent energy structure, we need to think about all of the jobs that are created through that American energy independence; and

it's not just the guys that are doing the offshore drilling, and it's not just the guys that are doing the hydraulic fracturing here. That is a tremendous component, and it's working in Pennsylvania, and should be working in southern New York. It's working in Ohio. It's producing resources.

When we talk about energy, we focus a lot right now on North Dakota. North Dakota, my gosh, it's a microcosm of what we could be in this country if we truly pursued an American energy policy. North Dakota, 3 percent unemployment or less. Some say it's a negative unemployment. I say, when you get off an airplane in North Dakota, they give you a job whether you need one or not. You talk about a lack of housing; they don't have housing for people coming up there to take the jobs. If you need a job in America and you're willing to travel to North Dakota, you can go up and get \$70,000 a year driving a water truck. Jobs are created.

North Dakota, a microcosm of what we could be in this country if we truly pursued an all-American energy policy, and that includes hydraulic fracturing. That includes drilling on Federal land that is currently off-limits to energy exploration, energy production, but it's also off-limits to wind and solar. Federal land that you own—America. The American taxpayers own this Federal land, and it ought to be utilized to the maximum benefit for American taxpayers.

Folks, we can reduce our fuel prices at the pump. We can reduce your prices for electricity at home, and that's through an American energy policy that's truly all of the above.

And so I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio leading this leadership hour, giving me an opportunity to speak about something that I am very passionate about, and that is an all-American energy policy that produces resources here, lessens our dependence on the Middle East, lessens our dependence on the OPEC cartel, truly trades with our neighbors to the north and the south, and approaches true independence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank my colleague from South Carolina, and at this time I yield to our chairman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me time.

As chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I would like to focus my remarks on the role of science and technology in Republicans' all-of-the-above energy strategy.

The Science Committee has oversight responsibility in two relevant areas. The committee oversees \$8.5 billion of the Department of Energy's research and development funding.

If we want to ensure that Americans have access to the affordable and reliable energy they need, we must strengthen DOE scientific research programs and EPA scientific integrity

principles. And that is what we intend to do this Congress.

As part of this process, the Science Committee expects to reauthorize the America COMPETES Act. A central component of that legislation is \$5 billion to the Department of Energy Office of Science, which maintains world-class research facilities through the National Laboratories. The office also supports innovative research that will help transform how we produce and consume energy.

We will also pursue energy legislation that improves prioritization and management of specific programs, from energy efficiency and renewable energy to nuclear, coal, oil, and natural gas.

The Science Committee recently received testimony that highlighted the massive costs and duplication of Federal subsidies for alternate forms of energy. The administration should not pick winners and give subsidies to favored companies that promote uncompetitive technologies. This too often leads to waste and bankruptcy, as we witnessed with Solyndra and other companies. Instead, we should focus our resources on research and development that will produce technologies that will enable alternative energy sources to become economically competitive without the need for subsidies.

Finally, we need to fix the EPA, which continues to levy numerous regulations that burden employers. Under the Obama administration, the EPA has aggressively sought to regulate nearly every aspect of the energy industry. It implements rules that burden employers and kill jobs. Insulting the taxpayers who fund the EPA, the administration refuses to release the scientific data upon which these burdensome regulations are based. This is entirely inconsistent with the President's stated commitment to lead the most open and transparent administration in history. The committee will continue to work to ensure that the EPA lives up to the President's transparency standard. The American people deserve to know all the facts, particularly since EPA regulations on the energy sector have a direct impact on their daily lives.

For example, the EPA has opposed a technological innovation that provides good-paying jobs for many Americans. The fracking revolution is changing the nature of American energy production. Hundreds of communities directly benefit from the economic turnaround due to energy production made possible by the fracking technology. These locations range from North Dakota to Pennsylvania to Texas. These States' household income growth and low unemployment is a direct result of revolutionary technology developments combined with sound energy policy and oversight at the State level.

Madam Speaker, on the Science Committee, we aim to ensure that Americans reap the benefits of this current energy technology revolution, and the Science Committee will do its part.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The gentleman has 31 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to my colleague from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Thank you so much for yielding as we talk about the importance of American energy independence and using all of our fuels and all of the above. I know that we all want to use all of the above, but there are a lot of people who want to put regulations so strict on coal that you can't use it anymore.

I hold up for you tonight the commemorative scissors that I used to cut the ribbon, along with a number of other people, at the Dominion Resources power plant in Virginia City, Virginia. And it wasn't 10 years ago; it wasn't 5 years ago. It was last September.

That plant would not be able to be built today if the regulations proposed by the EPA are actually adopted. Those would be the regulations relating to greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide.

When that plant was opened, they were so proud, and rightfully so. They had spent a lot of money, and they had the best technology available—the best technology available in the world—one of the cleanest plants ever opened to create electric power at a reasonable cost using the natural resources that God gave the United States of America, to use our coal supply in an appropriate, efficient manner.

Now, everybody says coal is dirty and we shouldn't use it; but we can use it in clean ways, like they're doing in the Dominion plant. I would also point out to you that as we send jobs away, are we really making any progress?

I note from one of the reports we've gotten from the Energy and Commerce Committee that at one point in time not too long ago the United Mine Workers estimated that job losses with the EPA targeting coal units due to utility MACT and tighter greenhouse gas standards could cost us more than 50,000 direct jobs in the coal, utility, and rail industries; and indirectly, a figure costing us jobs of more than 250,000 jobs lost.

That doesn't make a lot of sense because what we're doing is we're making it impossible to use our coal, where we, in fact, have the largest reserves of anywhere in the world. We are the Saudi Arabia of coal, and we don't want to use it, but many of the other nations of the world, including China, do want to use coal, and they are using coal. What's interesting about that is, when you look at that, looking at a report from the Sustainable Use of Coal and Pollution Control Policy in China, dated 2009—and this was a group of folks looking at what they can do to continue to use coal in China; it's an

international group trying to figure out what to do—they point out that, in China, the fraction of power capacity with unit scale smaller than 100 megawatts is 24.8 percent in 2007, while it is only 7 percent in the U.S. in 2007. The average coal consumption per unit powered electricity supply in China is 11 percent higher than that of Japan.

□ 1600

So what we're looking at is a situation where they're using more coal to produce the same power than we are, by about 24.8 percent for them and 7 percent in the United States. And when you get down to the pollution, you're looking at 30 percent to 150 percent higher than that in the United States.

Further, they go on to talk about the boilers, related to the maximum achievable control technology in boilers. And it says normally the thermal efficiency for boilers is between 72 and 80 percent, which is close to the design level of developed countries.

But, in reality, most of the actual thermal efficiencies are between 60 to 65 percent, which means they're 10 to 15 percent lower than the identified thermal efficiencies of boilers, which means, in effect, they're 30 to 40 percent less efficient, 30 to 50 percent less efficient than boilers in most of the developed countries.

So here's what we're doing, folks. We're taking the jobs from the United States; we're sending them over to China and other countries like India and so forth. They're producing the electricity to produce the goods that we used to produce in the United States. They're doing it less efficiently; they're creating more pollution. And, as a NASA study showed, it takes 10 days to get from the middle of the Gobi Desert, for that air to transport across the Pacific, 10 days from the middle of the Gobi Desert in China to the Eastern Shore of Virginia.

Folks, we have to be careful with the policies we make here. We all want clean air. We all want clean water. But we also want jobs, and we have to recognize the United States cannot solve this problem by itself. We must solve it with others working with us; and when they're not willing to start down that path and to make a good-faith effort, we have to recognize that we should be as efficient as we can be.

But we shouldn't be killing American jobs based on American energy when we know we can do it better and have less pollution than they can do it in other parts of the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank my colleague. I yield some time now to our colleague from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to point out that affordable American-made energy is the key to economic growth, economic development, and bringing this country out of the grips of the tough economic types that we're in.

I'm blessed to represent south Texas. The district I represent covers some

land that's part of the Eagle Ford Shale. There's a big oil and gas play going on there.

You know, it's not just the oilmen that are doing well. It's the restaurateurs that are doing well. I've never seen so many brand-new white pickup trucks. Some of this Texas oil and gas money is helping out the folks in Detroit: General Motors, Dodge, Ford. Some of these guys are even buying the Toyota trucks made in San Antonio, Texas.

It's an economic boom where we're actually struggling to find people to work. You can go to work in a fast-food restaurant for \$15 because they're competing with the oil and gas industry.

And you know what else is happening?

The low-cost natural gas that's abundantly available, they're saying 100 years' supply in Texas is creating new factories for manufacturing. In Corpus Christi alone, we've got two different steel mills coming in and using that gas to fire their plant. We're looking at a new plastics facility coming in.

And numerous other industries throughout the entire Texas coast, and even further inland, are realizing that affordable, American-made energy makes the United States competitive again. Even with the higher wages that we pay our employees in countries like China, with our low-cost energy, we can beat that.

Natural gas in the United States, especially in south Texas, we're in the \$4 range. If you were to buy that same natural gas and have it in Japan, it's \$18. We've got a huge opportunity here. We've got a huge economic advantage.

House Republicans, myself included, we support an all-of-the-above energy, and the technology is going to come. We're going to get the technology for wind. We're going to get the technology for solar. We're going to get the storage technology in batteries.

All that stuff Chairman SMITH was talking about that's going on with the Department of Energy and the Science and Technology Committee, those technologies are coming. But as we've seen with things like Solyndra and the tax credit that goes to wind farms, they're not economical today.

We have low-cost fossil fuel that will bridge us until those technologies are ready for prime time and ready to go. We need to take advantage of it. We need to open up the infrastructure with things like the Keystone pipeline. We need to open up Federal land so we can charge a royalty to the oil and gas companies for producing that on Federal land. That will bring money into the Federal budget that we could use for a wide variety of things: lowering the deficit, repairing our decaying infrastructure needs.

We need to be a country of "yes" to all-of-the-above energy, and it will solve our economic crisis, and we will have a better life for every single American.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. At this time, we'll go to my colleague from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN).

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of natural gas production to America's energy security.

Natural gas production is a critical part of a new economy, a new economy where energy costs are lower. In fact, there have been several articles lately that talk about manufacturing plants in Europe moving to the United States because of lower energy costs, because of the lower cost of manufacturing products using low-cost natural gas.

And, also, recent studies have shown that our greenhouse gases in the United States are lower because of more natural gas use.

My home State of Arkansas is an energy-rich State, and the Fayetteville shale play has helped fuel our State's economy. It's one of the biggest deposits of natural gas in the United States. It spans approximately 4,000 square miles. It's estimated to contain up to 20 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. It's considered one of the most productive shale plays in the country.

But what does that mean for everyday Americans? What does it mean, what has it meant for Arkansans?

Well, natural gas production is providing high-paying jobs for folks in my State and my district. According to the University of Arkansas, the average annual pay in the oil and gas extraction industry was \$74,000 in 2010. That's good pay. That's money that pays for food on the table, for a kid's education. That's twice the average pay of all industry in the State of Arkansas.

Further, the Fayetteville shale play supports over 20,000 jobs. It's added \$12 billion to Arkansas' economy since 2008. That impacts families.

Across the country, though, you've heard some detractors. These individuals have spread exaggerations, in some case, falsehoods about the environmental impacts of natural gas extraction through fracking.

And I want to point out that President Obama's own U.S. Geological Survey recently produced an important report that highlights the safety of natural gas production in Arkansas. Now, you're probably not hearing a lot about it, but it's an important study that was done in conjunction with Duke University and the University of Arkansas.

In January of this year, they published a study entitled "Shallow Groundwater Quality and Geochemistry in the Fayetteville Shale Gas Production Area."

What's the point of this study? The point of this study is that they tested groundwater, and they found that what's going on in the Fayetteville shale is environmentally safe.

The yearlong study examined the water quality of 127 shallow wells in the Fayetteville shale play. The report concluded there's no indication of systemic regional effects on shallow groundwater. This supports the understanding that natural gas production is safe for our environment and communities.

And as the father of two young children, I recognize the importance of ensuring that our air's clean and that our water's clean.

We must always seek to ensure that energy development is undertaken responsibly, but this report is an inconvenient truth for many out there who oppose fracking, which has given us so much natural gas and a competitive advantage.

Mr. Speaker, we must support the continuation of environmentally sound natural gas production in the United States to ensure our energy independence and further decrease our reliance on foreign sources of energy. It is absolutely critical to grow our economy so that families across the country can put food on the table and pursue happiness in this great country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 28 minutes remaining.

□ 1610

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I would like to now yield to my colleague from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. I thank my colleague from the Buckeye State. Ohio has always been a coal State. Now, with the Utica Shale plate, it's an oil and gas State.

Mr. Speaker, the HEAT Team is back for the 113th Congress. I'm proud to be joining the HEAT Team—the House Energy Action Team—as we talk about a dream: American energy independence. As part of that goal, I'll be talking this afternoon about power generation and grid reliability.

In Texas, bigger is always better. Texas got bigger than any State in the last 10 years. We did it for simple reasons: no state income tax; a right to work State; commonsense regulations; and cheap, reliable energy. To sustain that growth, we need five new large power plants in the next 2 to 3 years. It could be a matter of life and death. If we have a power crisis such as the heat wave like we had in August of 2011, when the entire State was over 100 degrees for all 31 days of that month, if that happens again, in the next 1 or 2 years, power may go out over the State, with rolling brownouts, rolling blackouts. That could be life and death for the elderly, the young, the poor.

The Obama administration's obstacles to fossil fuels is our greatest challenge. Radical environmentalists have killed two new, large power plants. One is the Las Brisas power plant near Corpus Christi, and the second is the White Stallion Power Plant, a coal plant, near Bay City, where we have two nuclear reactors. Las Brisas was like coal. It used petroleum coke to refine that to make it energy. Now we'll export that energy source overseas.

We need options to make sure that mothballed power plants can come back on line if we need them in a crisis.

But as we've seen in the past, these power plants run the risk of being sued for exceeding their environmental limitations from the EPA. I have reintroduced a bill, H.R. 271, in this Congress. It passed in the last Congress unanimously in the Energy and Commerce Committee, of which I'm a member. It passed unanimously on this floor last Congress. It's coming back in committee sometime in the next couple of weeks.

By passing this bill, we send a simple message: if the person or entity that runs the power grid tells you to keep that power plant up and running, and you exceed the EPA limitations, you cannot be held liable for exceeding the limitations when some government agency has told you to keep the power plant up and running. That's common sense.

I thank my colleague. I'm glad to be here because we have a chance again to make our country energy independent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I yield now to my colleague from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. In addition to our rich agricultural land, California's San Joaquin Valley is also blessed with an abundance of oil, natural gas, and renewable energy sources. These resources should be utilized to create jobs, lower energy costs for American families, and reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign energy. Instead, misguided public policy and overreaching Federal regulations have cost the Central Valley thousands of jobs and increased the price at the pump for all Americans.

Over the last several years, there have been dramatic changes in the energy policy of the United States. And as result, energy prices have significantly increased. Cap-and-trade legislation failed to pass the House in 2009. However, Washington bureaucrats have already implemented several parts of cap-and-trade through erroneous EPA regulations. These regulations put limitations on carbon emissions, diminishing oil and gas production in my district.

Since 1976, the number of environmental regulations in the Code of Federal Regulations has increased 25-fold. Regulations developed and enforced by the Environmental Protection Agency have had a devastating effect on energy production in the Central Valley as the EPA and other members of the Federal environmental bureaucracy continue to wage war on energy producers, costing California thousands of high-quality, good-paying jobs. By taking advantage of the natural resources in California, we can provide Americans with quality jobs, restore our economy, and reduce the struggle families face every day due to high energy costs.

The most efficient path toward reducing our dependence on foreign oil and lowering energy costs is an all-of-the-above approach that includes conventional sources of energy as well as renewable energy sources such as

hydro, solar, and wind power. My district is home to a growing number of wind and solar farms. Developing market-based energy sources will help the United States meet its energy independence goals. However, in order to meet our country's energy demand, we must rely on a mix of traditional means while we continue to develop alternative energy solutions for the future.

Promoting energy production from California's Monterey Shale, located directly under my district, could bring in 2.8 million jobs and raise an additional \$25 billion in new revenues by the end of the decade. This would not only strengthen the local economy but the State's economy as a whole.

Natural gas is a safe and responsible energy source with high economic output. In 2010, over 22,750 jobs were created in California alone. Studies show that natural gas production will save each American household approximately \$926 per year between 2012 and 2015. Hydroelectric power accounts for 63 percent of the clean power in this country and 8 percent of total electricity. Expanding hydropower production would further increase our energy independence from foreign countries. The Central Valley has the available workforce to construct and operate hydropower facilities throughout the Sierra Nevadas, which would not only produce energy to be used by the entire country but also provide the Central Valley with the ability to store a clean, reliable water supply.

My home State of California, and the entire United States, has been blessed with abundant conventional and renewable energy sources. Our constituents should not have to make tough decisions regarding their daily energy consumption when our Nation has the ability to produce enough energy to meet their needs. They should be able to water their yards, cool their homes in the summer, and drive their children to school without facing expensive energy bills and high prices at the pump.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from California for his comments today and would point out that in just a little bit we're going to hear from one of the sponsors of a hydropower bill that will make a significant difference in this State. And something that we ought to be doing more of is taking advantage of that clean, renewable energy resource.

I would yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi, ALAN NUNNELEE.

Mr. NUNNELEE. I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

America has been blessed with an abundance of natural resources. Because of private-sector innovations, we've seen a boom in energy development both on private lands and on State lands. Sadly, due to the Obama administration's extreme environmental agenda, in these same years we've seen a decline of energy recovery off of Federal lands. The most promi-

nent example of President Obama's prioritizing his radical environmental base over American energy development is the continued failure to approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

It's a sad commentary on the state of leadership in the modern-day Democratic Party compared with the record of men like President Kennedy. President Kennedy set out bold goals and then laid out ways of achieving those goals. He came to this very Chamber and challenged the elected representatives that before the decade is out, America would land a man on the Moon and return him safely back to Earth. America achieved President Kennedy's goals.

□ 1620

Now, given our resources from our friendly neighbors to the north, given American innovation, we should echo the challenge of President Kennedy. We should make it the goal of this generation that before this decade is out we become North American energy secure.

Now, there are vastly different undertakings between landing a man on the Moon and becoming energy secure, but the spirit required to achieve success in those areas is the same. The only thing standing between America and energy security for the future is an executive branch that's run by environmental extremists that are beholden to the wealthy liberal environmentalists.

Now, residents of Billionaires' Row in San Francisco can afford to indulge in fantasies of an economy run on windmills and solar panels. Meanwhile, men and women in Mississippi that are struggling to get to work know that it continues to break the better part of a \$100 bill to fill their car up with gas.

We, as elected officials who serve the people in need of affordable energy and a thriving economy, must deal with that reality. That's why I support an all-of-the-above approach. It does include renewable energy; but it also includes recovering American fossil fuels like oil, natural gas, recovering American coal that we can now burn cleanly without damaging the environment, and expanding nuclear energy, including small modular nuclear reactors used in the production of electricity. If we do that, America can be energy secure.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), who has been a sponsor of hydropower legislation to make this country stronger in terms of energy security.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank my colleague from Colorado for the time.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very simple question before us as Americans: When we're looking at young families struggling to be able to pay bills, senior citizens on fixed incomes wondering how they're going to be able to make that next payment to be able to heat their homes, or cool them as summer approaches, is it an appropriate time for

this Nation to seek what Jimmy Carter, in this very Chamber in 1976, challenged this country to do—to be able to achieve energy sufficiency? The answer can only be "yes."

The time is now for this Nation to be able to act. We see Americans struggling to be able to pay those bills. We're seeing Americans right now that are worried about being able to hold on to their jobs. This is an opportunity to be able to put Americans back to work and to be able to achieve that true energy self-sufficiency in this Nation. And it can be all-of-the-above.

In this last year, we passed a bill that I presented, planning for America's energy future, that enumerated that all-of-the-above strategy—wind, solar, hydroelectric energy, as well as coal, gas, our natural resources, to be able to develop them right here in America, to put our people back to work, and to be able to create that energy certainty.

When we look at this worldscape in which we currently live, the threats that are there, it is appropriate for this Nation to truly achieve energy self-sufficiency.

Through the bill that we just passed through the House of Representatives that my colleague noted, in the State of Colorado, through the ditches, the pipelines that have been built by the Bureau of Reclamation, we can generate as much electricity just in the State of Colorado as the Glen Canyon dam with small hydroelectric units. It can be that all-of-the-above strategy, but we also need to increase the production of our traditional fuel sources as well.

The time is appropriate. We have the resources and we have the technology to be able to do that. The question yet to be answered is: Will we rise to be able to actually meet that challenge?

As Americans, let us be committed to developing American energy on American soil, to be able to create American jobs, put Americans back to work, and to be able to create our own energy certainty at this time. The future of this country, the future for our children rely on those commonsense solutions. We're going to be putting them forward in this House. We're calling the American people and the Senate and the President to join us in that effort.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

May I inquire of the Speaker how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), the chair of the Natural Gas and Manufacturing Caucus.

Mr. REED. I so appreciate the gentleman yielding time, my good friend from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I join this conversation tonight coming at it from a perspective of being the chair of the Natural Gas

Caucus and cochair of the Manufacturing Caucus here in Washington, D.C., caucuses that have cochairs on a bipartisan basis, where we're working together to try to figure out how we can become energy independent, but more importantly, Mr. Speaker, what this issue represents for the average American family.

What this represents, when we are developing domestic energy sources such as the natural gas boom across America that's coming out of our shale formations and our tight sands formation when it comes to oil, what this represents to manufacturing is it puts American manufacturers in a competitive position so that they can invest in manufacturing facilities here on American soil.

So what does that mean? What that means to every man, woman, and child out there in America right now is that we are sitting on the precipice of a manufacturing renaissance in America. This competitive edge that we are getting from developing our natural gas and oil resources here in America means that we're going to build plants. They're going to be putting people back to work for today and tomorrow and for generations to come.

We need to build things in America. That's what this represents. We have a report from PricewaterhouseCoopers: by 2025, we are talking 1 million manufacturing jobs.

There should be no dispute in this Chamber to join hands to make sure we develop the energy resource in a safe and responsible manner, but develop it for the sake of creating those jobs that put food on people's tables, put a roof over their heads, and take care of families for generations to come.

I appreciate my good friend from Colorado yielding the time to me today. I just have to say, American energy means Americans' national security, and it means American prosperity for Americans of today and tomorrow.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, the other night when I was driving home from a meeting in one of my rural counties—it was about 8 o'clock, 9 o'clock at night, it was dark outside—I drove by a field of windmills. At nighttime, you can see that red light flashing across 100 wind turbines, and then of course the natural gas development that's taking place right next to it. So, Mr. Speaker, this Nation has an opportunity for energy security. It's not next year; it's now.

I thank my colleagues for joining this debate on American energy today and look forward to continued conversations throughout this year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, thank you, Mr. JOHNSON for leading tonight's leadership hour on American energy. This is an issue of great importance to the people of Montana, and I'm glad we're having this discussion tonight.

1678. That's how many days it's been since the application to build the Keystone XL pipeline was filed.

It took Canada seven months to approve the pipeline. President Obama has taken over four and a half years.

Study after study has shown that not only is the pipeline safe—but it said to be the most advanced, state-of-the-art pipeline ever constructed.

And the benefits of constructing this pipeline go beyond just transporting oil.

Earlier this month, I was in Glasgow, Montana visiting NorVal Electric Co-op. Members of the co-op told me that they are going to be supplying electricity to pump stations for the KXL, allowing them to spread their cost burdens and hold rates steady for customers.

If Obama does not approve the Keystone pipeline, their customers will see upwards of a 40 percent increase in their utility rates over the next ten years.

This is a great example of how this will impact everyday Americans.

It will create thousands of jobs—at least 800 in my home state of Montana alone.

And the president still can't make a decision.

Last month, the U.S. State Department issued its Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Keystone XL Presidential Permit application, which confirmed what we already knew.

The Keystone XL Pipeline will have no significant impacts on the environment.

In fact, this is the fourth environmental review of the Keystone Pipeline—with a final report still to come.

Let me be clear—this project means jobs.

This project could directly create more than 800 good-paying jobs in Montana—and thousands more across the nation.

It means coming one step closer to North American energy independence. The Keystone XL would be able to move up to 830,000 barrels of oil per day. That's about half the amount that the U.S. presently imports from the Middle East.

And of the oil moved each day, 100,000 barrels will come from the Bakken formation, which spreads across Montana and North Dakota.

This isn't about politics—Republicans and Democrats alike support the pipeline.

This is about our nation's security. This is about lowering energy costs for American families. This is about American jobs.

After four and a half years of waiting on President Obama to approve the Keystone XL pipeline, enough is enough.

The American people deserve action on this job-creating project, not more of President Obama's delays.

That's why today, the House Natural Resources Committee voted to advance the Northern Route Approval Act.

This bill makes it possible for the pipeline to be constructed in its entirety by removing the need for a presidential permit for the northern portion of the Keystone XL pipeline.

With this approval, we are one step closer to getting this pipeline approved.

The construction of the Keystone XL pipeline means hundreds of good-paying jobs created for Montanans, it means millions of dollars injected into our economy, and it even means lower utility rates for Montanans—we can't afford to wait any longer.

Enough is enough. It's been 1678 days.

As a member of the House Energy Action Team, I urge President Obama to approve the

Keystone XL Pipeline. And, if he won't act, we will.

REREFERRAL OF H.R. 763, REPEALING ANNUAL FEE ON HEALTH INSURANCE PROVIDERS

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 763 be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

KERMIT GOSNELL

(Mrs. BLACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today outraged and deeply saddened by the heartbreaking story of the abortion doctor, Kermit Gosnell. This is the man currently on trial for the murder of eight people, seven of whom were newborns who were killed after surviving late-term botched abortions in his "house of horror" clinic.

But Gosnell didn't act alone. He had a host of silent co-conspirators who referred women to his practice knowing full well of the horrors that went on behind those closed doors. Meanwhile, the State boards gave Gosnell a free pass for 17 years by failing to inspect his clinic.

When asked about Gosnell's crime, our President tells us he has no comment. Where is your outrage, Mr. President? Are you too busy preparing your remarks for tomorrow night's Planned Parenthood fundraising gala?

My heart breaks that our country has reached a point where we are all not outraged by a practice that ends a beating heart and takes the lives of our most vulnerable in our society. May God forgive us.

□ 1630

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor and a privilege to have the opportunity to stand here once again and to anchor the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order with my distinguished colleague from the Silver State, STEVEN HORSFORD.

For the next 60 minutes, members from the Congressional Black Caucus will speak directly to the American people about the importance of investing in the education of our children and of our young people as a matter of utmost importance for the future prosperity of this great country.

I've got the honor and the privilege of representing the 8th Congressional District, which includes parts of Queens, and it is largely anchored in neighborhoods in Brooklyn. And 100 years ago this month, in April of 1913, Ebbets Field opened for the first time. Ebbets Field, as the movie "42" has illustrated, is the baseball stadium where, on April 15 of 1947, Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier in America's pastime and became the first African American to participate in a Major League Baseball game.

Now, we know that prior to that moment, African Americans, solely on the basis of their color, were prohibited from playing Major League Baseball. And so you had individuals like "Cool Papa" Bell and Josh Gibson, any number of individuals who were stellar at their craft amongst the best who have ever played, confined to the Negro leagues, unable to ever get onto a Major League Baseball field because of the color of their skin.

That all changed on April 15, 1947, when Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier. And I think that holds an important point for us, what Jackie Robinson illustrated: that if you get an opportunity to get on the field of play, folks who otherwise have been excluded from the mainstream can demonstrate that they will perform just as well, if not better, than everyone else.

And in the context of education in the United States of America, we confront a situation where you have one group of children in this country who've got a first-rate education, and then you've got another group of children who are confined to a broken public school system that has failed them, that has inadequately prepared them for the opportunities that otherwise would be available in life.

We don't have necessarily, the literature has begun to show, an achievement gap that relates to capacity or ability. Yes, based on different performance measures, Black children and White children and Latino children score differently in various areas of proficiency, but the literature has begun to show that's not really an achievement gap. It's really an opportunity gap.

And what Jackie Robinson demonstrated, I think, for all of America to see is that, if you just give our children the same opportunities available to others through the educational system—give them the same bat, give them the same glove, give them the same cleats, allow them to perform on the same fields of human endeavor—that they can perform just as well, if not better, than everyone else.

And if you give them that opportunity, if you give all American chil-

dren opportunity, it's good for them, but it's good for the community and it's good for the Nation. It lifts everyone's productivity in a manner that will benefit America. That is why the CBC believes that investing in education is the appropriate and a meaningful and the right way to go, given what we confront in our country at this moment.

We've been joined by several distinguished members of the CBC. Let me first yield to my co-anchor, the distinguished gentleman from Nevada, Representative STEVEN HORSFORD.

Mr. HORSFORD. To my colleague and dear friend, the Representative from the 8th Congressional District of New York, it's good to join you for this hour of power to talk directly to our constituents and the American people about the priorities that we're focused on here in the United States House of Representatives and that we hope our colleagues on the other side will join with us to advance.

Today, we bring to the focus of this body the need to invest in opportunity through education. A pathway to a college education is a pathway into the middle class. And as a panel that was just convened, moderated by Wade Henderson, entitled, "For Each and Every Child," they indicated that, while a post-high school education is not an economic cure-all, it does provide a steppingstone to a good job and stable wages.

Now, every parent should be able to count on a good education for his or her children. As a father of three young children, I'm very focused on what my children need in the opportunities to advance in their lives and to be successful, as every parent is focused on, but, unfortunately, it is not always the case.

We need to refocus the conversation on educational opportunity, as my colleague, Mr. JEFFRIES, just indicated, and making sure that our children's future is not determined by a ZIP Code. Our schools should not be structured like a lottery system where some luck out and others strike out—to continue with your analogy, Mr. JEFFRIES.

Poor kids who are exceptional should be the norm, not the exception to the rule. They deserve the resources they need to be successful; and that's what we, on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus, are bringing forward here today.

In order to fix what's wrong right now, we need to change the way we think about our schools, because it's not simply schools that teach our students; it's actually the entire community. It is a community effort.

In 2011, 78 percent of high school graduates from high-income families enrolled in college. The shares for middle- and low-income families were 63 and 55 percent, respectfully. We have to work to close this gap and open a pathway to college for all students.

Now, today, we will hear from our colleagues who share with this need to

invest in education. We would like to talk about the particular issue that's affecting our Black men and boys in education. We want to focus on the need to grow more science and math majors. We know we need to invest in pre-K, and we want to outline our priorities as they compare to the Republican budget that's been offered by the other side.

And so as we enter into this hour of power to talk about education, I hope that we can cover these topics and others, and I look forward to this discussion.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, let me now yield to a great fighter for education and for social and economic justice here in the Congress and in this Nation, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

□ 1640

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Let me thank you, Mr. JEFFRIES, for yielding me this time, and thank you for your leadership here in the House of Representatives.

Since you have arrived here in the House, you have just done extraordinary work. You've taken the time to come to this floor and to educate and inform the masses of our people about the great, important issues facing our Nation. So I want to thank you for all of your work.

I also thank Mr. HORSFORD, the other gentleman who has taken the time to convene this special hour of presentations. I want to thank you for all of the work that you do. You are both freshmen, but you have the personalities and the abilities of someone who has been in this body for many years, so thank you very much.

The Congressional Black Caucus this evening has chosen to talk about the important subject of education. I am a strong supporter—a proponent—of strong public education. Mr. Speaker, there is no investment that we can make as a country that is more important than investing in children and investing in their education and in their higher education.

Regrettably, there are some people in this body who think otherwise. They may say that they don't think otherwise, but their actions demonstrate every day that they do not have a strong commitment to supporting our educational system in this country. There are even some Members of this Chamber who, regrettably, have said from time to time that they want to defund and eliminate the U.S. Department of Education. They feel that the educational responsibility of government belongs to the States and not to the Federal Government. That is so unfortunate, but I want to encourage all of us who serve in this body to work together and stay together and to try to promote public education in every way that we can.

Now, Mr. JEFFRIES, I cannot speak about the State of New York with any

authority or about the borough of Brooklyn—I know you do that very well in that you’ve been there for many years—but I can speak to my home State of North Carolina.

We have a demonstrated record of commitment and excellence in public education, both at the elementary and high school levels, as well as at the college level. We started way back in 1868 when our constitution was enacted. In the State constitution, we made sure that there was a provision that guaranteed a public education for every child in our State. Ensuring that our students have access to quality education has long been a principle of my State and of those that I associate with. So I have firsthand knowledge of our educational system. I know about the dedicated educators that we have in North Carolina, and I want to just encourage them and thank them for their service, and I urge them to keep on doing what they’re doing.

Mr. Speaker, I came from a family of educators. My mother was a classroom teacher. She taught school for 48 long years. Many people want to know how a single person could be in the classroom for that long, but my response is that, during those days, you did not need a college degree in order to be a classroom teacher—only a passionate commitment and a high school diploma.

I understand the importance of education, but even the most devoted and capable educators must have the resources to provide our children with quality education. We now face a defining moment for future generations of Americans in which some Republicans want to fix this budget by cutting funding for our students in schools. At the same time, we continue to be outpaced by other countries that continue to increase their educational investments.

In this country, the world’s most prosperous Nation, 25 percent of our children do not graduate from high school. More than 90 million adults have inadequate literacy skills. The numbers are even more startling for low-income children and African American children, many of whom live in my district. Less than 8 percent of students in advanced placement math or science courses are African American. Fewer than half of African American students graduate from high school on time, and that must change.

Despite these statistics, data show that investments in educational programs like Title I and IDEA and Race to the Top and Head Start and TRIO are instrumental in preparing our students to compete globally, but draconian cuts through sequestration have rolled back discretionary Education Department funding below the 2004 level and have gutted many of those programs.

My State will lose \$25 million in funding for primary and secondary education this year; 38,000 fewer students will be served in my State; and 350 edu-

cation jobs will be in danger. The Ronald McNair TRIO program for doctoral students from disadvantaged backgrounds, which was cut at Elizabeth City State University, is just one example. Many State legislatures, including that of my State, are cutting State education budgets at the same time. We must find ways to address our fiscal challenges without placing the burden on our children and our teachers.

While our goal must be to ultimately reauthorize the ESEA and the Higher Education Act, there are many ways we can help right now. We must preserve the maximum Pell Grant and keep interest rates on student loans low to enable low-income students to attend college. We must sustain funding for Race to the Top grants. In North Carolina, those grants have developed stronger curriculum in math and science, and they are working. They have strengthened teacher training and improved early childhood education.

Finally—and I will close—we must also protect other STEM funding streams through funding for NSF and NIH, which support innovative research in my district at Duke University, East Carolina University, Elizabeth City State University, and at my alma mater of North Carolina Central University. We must also support bills like H.R. 595, the Veterans Education Equity Act, which I introduced to resolve an inequity in existing law that unintentionally allots more education funds to veterans who are enrolled in private colleges than those in public institutions.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that education must be a priority. We must seize every opportunity to increase support for public education and not decrease it. Public education should be off-limits to budget cuts.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his extremely insightful comments and for his leadership on this issue.

We have also been joined by another dynamic member of the freshman class, who has taken the Capitol by storm with her intelligence and elegance. We are thankful for her leadership. Let me yield to the distinguished gentlelady from Ohio, Representative JOYCE BEATTY.

Mrs. BEATTY. I would like to join my other colleagues in thanking my freshman class members Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. HORSFORD for leading the Congressional Black Caucus’ discussion on this critical issue.

I rise today to be an advocate for improving access to quality education for minority students and to discuss the government’s role in breaking down economic barriers for educational opportunity.

You see, I know firsthand how important government assistance is for opportunity and quality education. I know that it makes a difference because, when my brother and I entered college—first-generation college grad-

uates in our family—we realized early on that we needed to do something with public education: it was government funding; it was access to a quality education; but more importantly, it was folks like Congressmen JEFFRIES and HORSFORD making a difference in our lives. But now we see there is still a significant number of hurdles that prevent many Americans from obtaining a quality education. Financial literacy, access to financial aid, quality education all play a critical role and must be a part of this national discussion.

I’m from the great State of Ohio. Last year, Ohio ranked seventh in the country for student debt, with the average student carrying \$28,683 in debt. I also know that the growing student loan is a burden in this country and makes it more difficult for families to achieve future financial security. If left unaddressed, it will affect us negatively over our broader economy. Currently, there are approximately 37 million student loan borrowers with outstanding student loans. These statistics threaten access to quality education and must be addressed.

One way to improve access to quality education, as I hope you will hear repeatedly tonight, is through the Pell Grant. Again, I know firsthand because, you see, when I was going to college, the Pell Grant in the early years was called the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant. There is that word again.

□ 1650

By receiving that, it gave me that opportunity that propelled me. And now, my sisters who follow me are all educators. My mother, like Congressman BUTTERFIELD’s mother, served many years, until she retired, going into public schools as a reading specialist assistant where she helped so many children understand the quality of that education and how reading and speaking would make a difference.

So you see, Pell Grants have been the cornerstone in the lives of many minorities seeking higher education and have provided more than \$4 billion to African American college students each year. Without the Pell Grant program, hundreds of thousands of minority students would not be able to afford to go to college.

I’ve also had the experience of working as a leader in a 4-year institution in our great State, the largest single campus university in this country, Ohio State University. I am proud to say that they are strong advocates for us making sure that we continue to put dollars into the Pell Grant so children of all races, ethnicity and color will be able to have that quality education.

That is why the escalating cost of education acutely affects students of all color and their access to a quality

education. We need to also improve quality education by promoting STEM programs, STEM programs that build a pipeline of a highly skilled workforce for today's high-tech and industrial jobs.

Last year, African Americans received just 7 percent of STEM-related bachelor's degrees, 4 percent of master's degrees and only 2 percent of doctorates. American colleges and universities are poised to produce about 3 million science, engineer, technology and math STEM majors over the next decade. However, there has only been a 2 percent to 3 percent increase of African Americans in STEM professions over the past year.

So, you see, we come tonight to ask this body, this Congress to be supportive of making sure that children, and especially minority children, African American children, be able to be our Jackie Robinsons, as we have today with our two leaders who stand here today as our Jackie Robinsons of scholarship.

With that, I thank you for allowing me the opportunity to come today.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished Congresswoman from Ohio.

I note the connection to Ohio State University that we share in my family. My brother is a professor of history at Ohio State's great institution. Your contribution to opening up opportunities for people of color and all students at such a great public university is noted.

It is important, I think, for this institution to take a look at several of the issues that you've raised, Congresswoman, that Representative HORSFORD and I will shortly explore.

The debt situation is particularly troublesome, and I'm going to ask the gentleman from Nevada if he would make a few observations in connection to what Representative BEATTY noted is a student-loan problem that we have here in America.

Now, the interesting thing is that during the 110-plus days that we all as freshmen have been in this Chamber, we've heard a lot of talk about the moral imperative of dealing with the debt situation that we confront in America. And every time we're about to hit the debt ceiling, there are some in this Chamber who have said that we should perhaps default to send a message that some in this country apparently are reckless with their spending habits.

Now, parenthetically, this is, of course, a complete mischaracterization of what the debt ceiling actually represents. It's not a forward-looking vehicle designed to give the President the opportunity to spend more. It's a backward-looking vehicle designed to allow this administration, or any administration, to pay bills that this Congress has already incurred.

But whenever we talk about the debt, my friends on the other side of the aisle raise it as a moral imperative. I think the fact that we've got student

loan debt in America that now exceeds, as the chart illustrates, more than \$1 trillion is really what imperils future generations in this country. You've got young people saddled with, on average, in excess of \$25,000 per person in debt facing a tough job market, with the inability often to find employment in their field of endeavor, to start a family, to purchase a home, the things that traditionally have been associated with pursuit of the American Dream.

The prescription that has been put forth by the other side, as it relates to how to alleviate this debt connected to students, is very different than the one that, I think, we on this side of the aisle have chosen to offer.

Let me now yield to the gentleman from Nevada if he might elaborate on our CBC vision for how to deal with the student loan problem or the education of young people in America.

Mr. HORSFORD. I say thank you to my colleague from New York.

Before I elaborate further, let me say that first you have to understand that there is a problem in order to address the problem. I think far too often some of our colleagues on the other side fail to recognize the fact that so many families who are struggling to help their students obtain a college degree are having to do so through student loans and rely greatly on Pell Grants for that assistance. Maybe it's because they don't have that same experience that they don't understand why these are important.

This is what the House Republican budget would mean for those very programs that you're talking about. First, the Republican budget freezes the maximum Pell Grant for the next 10 years, even though Congress already enacted and paid for mandatory annual inflationary increases in 2010. With this one step, they slash higher education funding by \$83 billion.

The House Republican budget allows the interest rate on need-based student loans to double this summer.

The House Republican budget eliminates the income-based repayment program, which provides that Federal student loan borrowers can cap their loan payments at 15 percent, going down to 10 percent in 2014 of their discretionary income each year.

The reason that this is so important is because of constituents like the ones I spoke to on Sunday in my district. We were talking about the immigration issue. But as we were discussing that, many of them came to me and said, Well, you know what? I've had to borrow \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 in student loans to acquire this degree, and I'm now working in the field I'm in, but unfortunately it's taking \$1,000, \$1,500, \$2,000 a month of my income to pay back those student loans.

At the very time these families are struggling to do that, the Republican budget proposes to slash it further. Not only does it slash support for individuals and families who rely on student loans, as I said, they also freeze the

maximum Pell Grant, which so many low-income families and students desperately depend on.

This is a real issue, and it's a real difference. That is why we are here today to bring attention to the differences between the two sides. I hope that as we move forward, we can find common ground.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something, because sometimes I know when we talk about the needs of educating Black children, that people will say, What about other communities? My answer to that is that if we can help improve the education for Black children in America, we will improve education for all children in America, whether they be Latino or White or Asian.

□ 1700

And so that is why we need to have an investment in education in America, not to defund, not to slash, not to reduce or not to freeze funding, but to invest in the very things that we know work and that will improve the successes for young people to succeed in life.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the gentleman from the Silver State for those very astute observations. As Representative HORSFORD has pointed out, a budget essentially is a choice and a pathway forward that people in this Chamber are making decisions on based on what they see as best for America. And the Republican budget that was passed by this House, as Representative HORSFORD has indicated, in total would cut \$168 billion in spending on higher education. That's a value choice, to walk away from young people in America, young people who already are being saddled with in excess of \$1 trillion in debt in total.

Now, what else does that budget do? Well, it says that we're going to take the top tax rate, which is 39.6 for millionaires and billionaires, the wealthiest and the well off, and we want to slash that tax rate down to 25 percent. So we're going to cut education spending for, among other reasons, to cut further the taxes paid by the wealthy and the well off in this country. That is a choice that is bad for America. It's bad for the middle class. It's bad for working families, and it's bad for our future.

We have been joined by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, an expert in all matters pertaining to the budget in this Congress, among other things. Representative BOBBY SCOTT is an expert on the CBC budget, in the budgets that have come out of this House of Representatives, and it is my honor and privilege to now yield to him.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for his leadership on this issue and many other issues that he's been working on while we've been serving on the Judiciary Committee together.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an issue that is important to our

society, and that is access to higher education. Our Nation's economic competitiveness depends on our ability to educate our next generation. We compete with nations all over the world for business, and our competitive advantage is in our education.

We're not going to compete on low wages. There are people who'll work for much lower wages than we'll work for in the United States, and so we're not going to win the battle of a race to the bottom on wages.

We're not going to win the battle by requiring workers to work near their coworkers. If you can work across the hall from your coworkers, if you have a computer, a modem, a fax machine, a cell phone, if you can work across the hall, you can work across the globe. So there's no urgency to have people located here in the United States.

And if you can manufacture goods anywhere in the world, you can have them delivered anywhere else in the world, so you don't have to be there to be close to your customers. There used to be a time where if you wanted to build a manufacturing plant, to get financing it had to be here in the United States. Now we have worldwide banking. You can build that plant anywhere in the world.

The reason businesses want to locate in the United States is because they know they can get a well trained and well-educated workforce, and we need to make sure that we don't fall behind because that is our economic competitive advantage.

We know that neighborhoods rely on education because those neighborhoods that have high investment in education are much less likely to suffer from crime and pay for social services.

We know that individuals benefit from education. There's an old adage that the more you learn, the more you earn. The kind of job that you can get in America today in our high-tech, information-based economy depends on the education that you get. In fact, according to the Department of Labor, 90 percent of the fastest growing, best-paying jobs in the United States will require at least some education past the high school level. Not necessarily a 4-year college, maybe community college or career education, but some education past the high school level.

And while the benefits of getting an education are important and well known, how to get that education is becoming a challenge. People have to pay for that education. Many people apply for financial aid. That includes scholarships, loans, grants, and also the well known Pell Grant. The Pell Grant provides up to \$5,500 a year for an education. Unfortunately for many students, although the Pell Grant used to cover the cost of tuition, rarely does it provide tuition today. In fact, the College Board suggested the average cost of tuition is over \$10,000. Many public colleges charge as much as \$22,000, so a student has to come up with as much as \$15,000 over the Pell

Grant to be able to afford tuition and room and board.

In most circumstances, students can obtain student loans to cover the difference. It is also critical that students know what they're getting into when they take on student loans because these are not grants. These are loans that have to be paid back with interest.

We've been helping students with these loans. In fact, when we passed the Affordable Care Act a couple of years ago, we included \$1.5 billion to strengthen the income-based repayment program that currently allows students to cap their monthly student loan payments to 15 percent of their discretionary income. We need to do more.

The College Cost Reduction and Access Act, which was signed in 2007, included a reduction in interest on student loans from 6.8 percent down to 3.4 percent. That expired last year but we extended it, and we need to extend it again and even make it permanent so that the loan interest rate doesn't go up again.

There is other legislation spending. Congresswoman KAREN BASS has a 10/10 program that will allow payments to be made of 10 percent of your discretionary income for 10 years, and the rest can be written off. There are other things that are pending.

But Mr. Speaker, we need to make sure that every student that studies and is prepared for college has that opportunity. We need to make sure that no student is discouraged from enhancing their education because they don't believe they can afford it. We need to do what we can for student loans, increasing Pell Grants, and making those opportunities real. Our Nation depends on it. Our neighborhoods depend on it, and our next generation depends on it. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank Representative SCOTT. We both sit on the Judiciary Committee, and in the context of our service on the Judiciary Committee, we will be presented with an opportunity to deal with the issue of comprehensive immigration reform. Already two hearings have been held on this matter.

One of the issues that has consistently come up is the need to increase the number of H-1B visas for highly skilled immigrants in the STEM field—science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

□ 1710

The technology-and-innovation economy and sector in this country have taken off, and there are actually opportunities. Some estimate approximately 20 percent of the workforce has openings in the technology-and-innovation sector that many would like to see filled by opening up the opportunities for highly skilled immigrants. It's an approach that I think shares bipartisan support.

But, simultaneously, many of us believe that, as a country, we must also

invest in STEM education for our children and our young people to make sure that, moving forward, they have the opportunity to develop careers in the STEM fields in a manner that will benefit themselves, their families, their communities and, by extension, the country.

And so before I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, I believe that Representative HORSFORD had an observation or two to make in the area of the need to invest in STEM education.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you, Representative JEFFRIES. And you provided the clear nexus.

While the Congressional Black Caucus, working with our colleagues from the Hispanic Caucus and the Asian Pacific Islander Caucus, supports comprehensive immigration reform, including provisions that allow the best and the brightest from around the country to immigrate to the United States and to contribute to making our country great, we also believe that there should be investment here in the United States to educate those of us here for these careers in the 21st century.

Colleges and universities in our country will produce 3 million STEM majors in the next 10 years. Still, according to a 2012 report by the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, our economy will demand more students graduating with STEM degrees than we are currently providing.

So what can we do?

We need to increase funding in STEM education and follow the lead of many of our Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Hispanic-serving institutions which are producing a greater share of students with STEM degrees.

Among HBCUs, currently, they produce about 19 percent of all STEM bachelor degrees, 38 percent of which are in the biological sciences, 31 percent in math, 35 percent in computer science, 34 percent in the physical sciences, and 22 percent in engineering.

Now, the Obama administration has requested more investment for STEM teachers and additional funds to expand effective models of teacher preparation to help train 10,000 STEM educators per year. That's what the President's budget proposes. Those are the same priorities, they are the right priorities, and they're the priorities that the Congressional Black Caucus agrees need to be supported by this Congress.

We need to invest in teachers that will train students for jobs in the 21st century. But let me be clear: you can't expect students to graduate with degrees in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology if we're not doing more to invest in pre-K and to help students start with a strong foundation. And that's why the President has a historic level of investment in his budget for early childhood education and pre-K.

We enroll most kids in this country at 5 or 6 years old. We should be starting them earlier; 50 years of research

tell us that critical development and learning happen before the age of five. When schooling starts at kindergarten or first grade, it denies these young people chances to make the most of this critical period.

Fundamentally reforming our education system begins with high-quality pre-kindergarten programs. In my opinion, pre-kindergarten is an antidote for the achievement gap. In cases where our kindergarten teachers are getting kids who've had, in some cases, 2 years of early education, they're seeing that the achievement gap has stopped or been narrowed. That's why we need to invest in programs like Head Start so that we don't have to play catch-up later or deny these young, bright minds the opportunities to go into the fields of the 21st century.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is an and/also strategy, not an either/or. We believe that we can invest in both early childhood education, K-12 education and higher education, not cut, slash or deny these opportunities to America's children. These are our priorities, and it's what we'll continue to fight for for all of America's children.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Thank you, Representative HORSFORD. And as was noted earlier, the CBC believes that there are children all across America, in many inner-city communities, certainly in the neighborhoods that I represent back home in Brooklyn and places like Bedford-Stuyvesant and east New York and parts of Coney Island, where the public school system has failed them for decades, generation after generation after generation subjected to a broken public school system, from a very early point, all the way through high school.

And unless we invest in turning these broken systems around, we're essentially at risk of dooming young people to life sentences of disadvantage and despair. That's why the CBC supports the President's proposal in his budget to invest an additional \$75 billion over a 10-year period, as Representative HORSFORD indicated, in early childhood education to make sure that we give every American child the opportunity to be successful by putting them on an even plane with those who get the benefit of a first-rate public or private school education.

I want to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, another dynamic member of the freshman class, Representative DONALD PAYNE, Jr., who was a leader on education issues prior to arriving in the Congress, and he's continued to demonstrate leadership in this area and in other areas moving forward.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, Congressman HORSFORD of Nevada and Congressman JEFFRIES of New York, for anchoring tonight's CBC Special Order on improving access to quality education.

The recession, the economy, violence and gun control, the security of our Nation, these are the pressing issues

being debated across this great Nation today. However, efforts to address the issues are being undermined by our Nation's educational deficit.

John F. Kennedy said that "our progress as a Nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. The human mind is our fundamental resource."

True to this statement are struggles that we face as a Nation because of our divestment in our human mind and potential. In the past, the U.S. led the world in several categories, including college graduates and innovation. Unfortunately, there has been a rapid decline in our ranking in these areas that directly correlates to the strength of this Nation.

Among these things, the U.S. has dropped considerably in academic rankings, compared to other developed nations. About 33 percent of our Nation's fourth-grade students are proficient readers. Nearly 7,000 students drop out of high school daily, and about a third of first-year American college students are required to take at least one remedial course.

Globally, our rankings have fallen of our students in reading to 14th; in science, to 17th; and in mathematics, to 25th. Despite these daunting statistics, the U.S. continues to lead the world in competitiveness, patents, media, mobile and research universities. But imagine the leadership that we could hold in the world if we strengthened our investment in education.

Our Nation continues to be at a loss due to the untapped potential of our students, especially students of color and low income.

□ 1720

For this particular population, the statistics are even more daunting, but the potential is greater as well. Forty-two percent of Black students attend schools that are under-resourced and performing poorly. Twenty-eight percent of core academic teachers at high-minority schools lack the appropriate certification. Black children, especially boys, are more likely to be classified and placed in special education than their white counterparts. Black and Hispanic males constitute 82 percent of the youth in special education programs. Black boys are 2.5 times less likely to be enrolled in talented and gifted programs, even if their prior achievement reflects the ability to succeed.

Yet despite these demoralizing facts, despite the failure of the American education system to properly educate these students, nearly 3 million college students in America are African American. And only 13 percent of the U.S. population, Black students represent 15 percent of the college student population.

Currently, these are beating the odds; but imagine how we could develop and succeed as a Nation if we changed the odds for these students

and closed the opportunity gap. What if we strengthened our education system and allowed all children to reach their full potential? What if we fostered an environment of innovation and leadership for this Nation's outcomes in all communities equally?

We have long held the solutions to address these issues, but they aren't coordinated or connected. We have the potential to reach new heights as a Nation, but it requires a stronger education system as well as effective solutions and resources to change the odds for our children in the most distressed communities.

I will be introducing the Promise Neighborhoods Act soon to do just that. The Promise Neighborhoods initiative represents an unprecedented effort to work across silos and develop a comprehensive cradle-to-career pipeline for children in distressed neighborhoods to holistically address barriers to success. The Promise Neighborhoods Act would foster continued collaboration on the local level to build similar pipelines in communities across this country.

The pipeline of tightly woven, comprehensive support for children emphasized in the Promise Neighborhoods Act would provide, among other things: prenatal education and support for expecting parents;

high-quality early childhood education opportunities, including full-day, full-year kindergarten and pre-kindergarten;

high-quality schools that successfully leverage out-of-school time and community engagement;

support for the transition to elementary school, between elementary school and middle school, and from middle school to high school;

meaningful family engagement and capacity-building;

college and career readiness activities, including college counseling, subsidized employment opportunities, and early college programs;

neighborhood-based support for college-age students from the neighborhood.

This model engages the community to collaborate and end fragmented delivery of programs to develop a pipeline for programs with demonstrated success. This model aims to eliminate the opportunity gap for low-income children and children of color and set a new standard for education and success in this country.

Though not realized, our Nation holds a great deal of underdeveloped potential, and it lies within our human capital. Investing in education will strengthen our Nation as a whole and position us to once again lead the world. Education is the single investment that can unequivocally develop our economy and strengthen our future.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for his very astute observations.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on this Special Order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has approximately 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I thank the Representative from New Jersey for making it clear that all children in this country deserve the opportunity to be part of a pipeline toward progress and prosperity, even though some, unfortunately, have been subjected to circumstances that often lead to a pipeline from the schoolhouse to the jailhouse. That's not how things should be anywhere in America. And that's why we believe a robust investment in education is the right way to go in this country.

I'm going to ask the distinguished gentleman from the Silver State for his observations on this chart. The chart illustrates that education pays. If you invest in education, increase the level of degree of attainment, what it does is increase the capacity for Americans to earn a better living.

And so, for example, for Americans who have less than a high school diploma, their average weekly earning is \$451. But someone with a high school diploma earns, on average, \$638 per week. And someone with a bachelor's degree earns, on average, \$1,053 per week. If you give an American an advanced degree, their average earnings per week increase to in excess of \$1,600.

Investing in education pays for the American people.

I yield to my distinguished colleague from Nevada.

Mr. HORSFORD. Just to elaborate further on this point, education attainment is an economic imperative. Not only is it the investment in the individual that proves great dividends and a return on investment, but the failure to invest, based on the bottom line in red, for someone with less than a high school diploma the likelihood of them being unemployed is 14 percent. For those with a high school diploma who are unemployed, it's 9.4 percent. If you have a bachelor's degree, the unemployment rate drops in half, to 4.9 percent. And if you have a professional degree, the unemployment rate is 2.4 percent.

So the correlation is clear that with education attainment come economic prosperity, opportunity, and a return on investment that is good for that individual, their ability to provide for themselves and their family, and for our entire country.

And so, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about investment, we're not talking about investments in programs or systems. We're talking about investments in people. When we talk about Head Start, we're talking about 3- and 4-year-old children. When we talk about title 1 funding, we're talking about schools and children that are identified as having low-income needs and the disadvantaged. When we talk about funding for IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, we're talk-

ing about individuals. And the more that we can invest in the individuals in America, the greater return we will have in the productivity of that individual, their family, the community they live in. And that will make for a stronger America for all of us. That is what we are aspiring to accomplish in this 113th Congress.

We want to work with our colleagues on the other side. Where they can meet us in the middle to find solutions to make these investments, we look forward to working with them. But one thing we will not do is to slash, defund, or freeze the investment of the American children and the American family.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the gentleman from Nevada. We will not, as he indicated, support any budget that balances itself on the backs of children or young people or college students in America. Unfortunately, that is the budget that has been put forth by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We support a balanced approach to dealing with the economic problems that we have in this country that involves the investment in education. That is what we stand for. That's what is good for America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it has been over 60 years since the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* desegregated our schools. Yet an achievement and opportunity gap remains among our minority and low-income students.

As Members of Congress who represent communities of color, the purpose of today's special order is to highlight an economic and social crisis America faces if this problem is not confronted and significant measures are not taken. Particularly, we must focus our efforts on closing the gap in the STEM disciplines. As the First Female and First African American Ranking Member of the House Science, Space and Technology Committee, this is an issue that is very serious to me and has been one of the pillars of my legislative agenda in the United States Congress for over 20 years.

Ensuring minorities are proficient in STEM is more than just a question of equity. We have a vast, untapped pool of talent in America, and this pool is continuing to grow. It is estimated that, by 2050, 52 percent of the U.S. population will be from underrepresented minority groups. Our "Nation's Report Card," by the National Assessments of Educational Progress, shows that students from underrepresented minorities are falling behind in math and science as early as 4th grade.

At the Post Secondary level, even though students from underrepresented minorities made up about 33 percent of the college age population in 2009, they only made up: 19 percent of students who received an undergraduate STEM degrees Less than 9 percent of students enrolled in science and engineering graduate programs, and; Barely 8 percent of students who received PhDs in STEM fields. Frankly, all of these numbers are much too low.

I also must underscore the important role that community colleges play in providing to STEM degrees for minority students. 50 per-

cent of African Americans, 55 percent of Hispanics, and 64 percent of Native Americans who hold bachelor's or master's degrees in science or engineering attended a community college at some point. We cannot afford to ignore the role of community colleges.

We have to drastically increase the number of African American students from these groups receiving degrees in STEM disciplines, or we will undoubtedly relinquish our global leadership in innovation and job creation. We know school administrators, teachers, community leaders, public-private partnerships and parents all play a critical role in addressing this issue. No one person or organization can do it alone. We must all work together to leverage our respective strengths and resources to tackle this challenge.

For example, the corporate community was highly involved supporting a bill I co-authored, the America COMPETES Act. As many of you are aware, I recently introduced the STEM Opportunities Act of 2013 this March. The STEM Opportunities Act of 2013 will help address many of the challenges faced by women and underrepresented minorities pursuing science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) research careers by:

Requiring the National Science Foundation (NSF) to collect more comprehensive demographic data on the recipients of federal research awards and on STEM faculty at U.S. universities (while protecting individuals' privacy); Promoting data-driven research on the participation and trajectories of women and underrepresented minorities in STEM so that policy makers can design more effective policies and practices to reduce barriers; And developing, through the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), consistent federal policies, such as no-cost extensions and flexibility in timing for the initiation of the award, for recipients of federal research awards who have caregiving responsibilities, including care for a newborn or newly adopted child and care for an immediate family member who is sick.

We're all in this together, and working together I know we can achieve great success.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 527, RESPONSIBLE HELIUM ADMINISTRATION AND STEWARDSHIP ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah (during the Special Order of Mr. JEFFRIES), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-47) on the resolution (H. Res. 178) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 527) to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1730

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I've listened to the dialogue over the last, oh, 30 to 60 minutes and I'm a little bit surprised that some of the advocates for the comprehensive immigration reform bill wouldn't simply look at the impact on a lot of their friends and neighbors. We see the highest unemployment in the African American community. That's the direct competition that comes in if they grant amnesty on the Senate side. I ask the gentleman to reconsider that. The best thing that would be would be more jobs for people that are here that are Americans.

I see the gentleman from Texas has arrived. Generally, there is a pretty good narrative that comes forth from the gentleman from the Beaumont area, so I would be very pleased to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

PROFESSOR RICHARD FALK IS IN FANTASY LAND

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding some time. I want to address the House on a different issue tonight, but I do appreciate the time and letting me be off the subject that he was going to, and will, talk about momentarily.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, there are people in Boston—and really around the world, and in the United States especially—trying to recover from the terrorist attack that took place in Boston. The Richard family laid their 8-year-old boy to rest, as did other families. As a father of 4 and a grandfather of 10, no parent or grandparent ever wants to see a child die in their youth, especially being murdered the way this young lad was.

But meanwhile, in the halls of academia, Richard Falk, a professor and an official with the United Nations Human Rights Council, he blamed the terrorist attack on what he claims is American global domination—and on the country of Israel, of all things. What an absurd comment for this so-called “intellectual” to make. The vile comments come only 2 years after he personally was reprimanded by the United Nations for promoting fantasy-like 9/11 conspiracy theories.

Mr. Speaker, why is Richard Falks still employed by the United Nations Human Rights Council?

Can someone please explain why the United States also continues to be the largest funder of the United Nations, which gives radical wingbats like Falk a platform to spew their hate and anti-American rhetoric? I don't think the United States should be bankrolling the United Nations Human Rights Council. Let them find somebody else to foot the bill for this international institute of ingratitude.

It's time for the elitist, uninformed like Mr. Falk to go, and it's certainly time for the United States to stop

funding the Human Rights Council. We don't need to pay people like Professor Falk to hate America. People like him will do it for free.

Meanwhile, let's try the Boston terrorists for their crimes against America; hold them accountable for murder. And don't try to blame America for the murder of America's children. Blame the killers.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his message. It's one that I hope, Mr. Speaker, is well heard across America: You don't have to pay them to hate us. They hate us for free. They hate us for our ideology and for our success, for all of those reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I came here to the floor tonight to talk about the immigration issue here in the United States Congress, primarily that has emerged in the United States Senate out of the Gang of Eight.

We know that there are some of these policies that are being worked through in meetings behind closed doors in the House of Representatives. They seem to admit to those meetings, but they're not very public and we don't know very much about what they're talking about. I just get nervous when I see bills written in secret.

The Gang of Eight wrote their bill in secret and popped it out last week or so, a little more, and we began to look through 844 pages. Surprise. Well, shortly after the bill was dropped, then the chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Senate calls hearings and begins to do the fastest process that they can legitimately get done to try to move an immigration amnesty bill out of the Senate before it gets so many holes poked in it that it sinks of its own weight.

I take you back, Mr. Speaker, to: How did we get here? What was the scenario? What's the path of immigration? I will go through the fast-forward version, backing this up to 1986.

In 1986, it became a political issue that we had too many people in the United States illegally. There was an effort made to resolve the issue and the effort was this:

Part of the people in the argument said they wanted better border security and they wanted better immigration enforcement. The other side of the argument said we've got to do something to legalize people that are here that—I don't know if they used the language then if they were in the shadows or not. Those two arguments came together here in this Congress. And with Ronald Reagan sitting in the White House, he received significant pressure from the people around him that urged him to sign the 1986 Amnesty Act. Now, that was one of only two times that Ronald Reagan let me down in 8 years. But he accepted the arguments that the only way to get agreement on enforcement and to be able to respect and restore the rule of law was to make the people that were here illegally legal.

The tradeoff was amnesty in exchange for enforcement.

So, Mr. Speaker, the projection originally was 800,000 people in this country illegally that would get instantaneous legalization status, and then that number of course grew to 1 million. Roughly, that was the projected amount at the time that the bill was debated in Congress. We know that, instead, there wasn't 1 million people. It was 3 million people that ended up receiving amnesty from the deliberations in this Congress, the tug-of-war that came together, and it's a product of compromise. I would point out that compromise isn't always a good thing. This would be one of those examples.

The compromise was, in exchange for the promise of future enforcement, Ronald Reagan would sign the bill to instantaneously start the process to legalize the people that were illegally in the United States. Sounds familiar. Well, he signed the bill in '86. What we got was instantaneous legalization of the people that were here—triple the number that was projected—and the effort to get law enforcement was undermined continually. It was undermined in a number of ways: through litigation, through lack of will. As it ground forward, the respect for the rule of law, especially with regard to immigration law, diminished in each year.

As we've seen, the enforcement of our immigration laws has diminished in each administration, from Ronald Reagan through Bush 41, to Bill Clinton, to Bush 43, and now to Barack Obama. That's the path that has taken place.

Just a year ago, the debate was: Would Congress pass the DREAM Act, the DREAM Act being the legislation that I'll say the chief advocate for it in the Senate has been Senator DURBIN of Illinois. He has identified with it more than anyone else. But the DREAM Act is: those kids that came here, say, before their 18th birthday—and that goes up and down to 16, or on up to a little older than that. Those that came here when they were relatively young, maybe due to no fault of their own—theoretically, someone who was born 5 minutes before in a foreign country that was brought in by their parents as a little baby would get a legal status. And, by the way, in-State tuition discounts so they can go to college, get legal status, and be able to work in the country.

In other words, it was amnesty for those young people who presumably came into this country not of their own will or perhaps not of their own knowledge that it was against the law to enter the United States illegally, or those that might have been brought into the country under a visa of one kind or another, overstayed their visa and didn't have a legal status anymore. In any case, the younger people given a path to a legal status and a legal green card here in the United States, that's the DREAM Act.

A year ago, Mr. Speaker, it was not something that could pass the United

States Congress. They long wanted to get the DREAM Act passed, but they could not because we stood on the rule of law and we said we are not going to reward people who break the law with, let's just say, a de facto scholarship to a university—and in California, it would be a free ride. I made the argument that how can you legalize people that are here illegally, refuse to enforce the law, the clear directive of the law, and have people sitting in a classroom in, say, California with a free ride while someone who has lost their husband or wife in battle in Iraq or Afghanistan, who finds themselves the sole breadwinner for their family, wants to go to California—I'll use as the example—and have to pay out-of-State tuition in a California institution, who is a widow or a widower of someone who has given their life for our country, they're sitting there next to someone who is in the United States illegally that gets a free ride because they've been declared a California resident.

□ 1740

I could never reconcile the huge inequity, the injustice of that idea, and neither could a majority of Americans or a majority of the United States Congress. That's why the DREAM Act wasn't passed. Just a year ago that couldn't be done.

The President said on March 28 of 2010, when he was speaking to a high school group here in the Washington, D.C. area, they asked him: Why don't you just pass the DREAM Act by executive order, implement that? And the President's answer was: No, I don't have the constitutional authority to do so. That is a legislative branch activity. And he said: You're smart, you're educated, you know that in the three branches of government Congress' job is to pass the laws, my job as President, the head of the executive branch, is to carry those laws out and see to it that they are enacted and enforced, and the judicial branch is to rule on their constitutionality to tell us what the laws are understood to mean.

That was the description that the President gave March 28, 2010. He said he didn't have the authority to implement a DREAM Act by executive authority. Congress wouldn't pass it a year ago; the President said he couldn't do such a thing constitutionally, March 28, 2010. And here we've come so far that in June or July—and I don't have those dates in front of me, nor committed to memory, Mr. Speaker—the President went back on his own advice, word, oath of office and counsel when they issued an executive memorandum.

He held a press conference at the White House within a couple hours of the executive memorandum and said: We are going to legalize all of these people that are here within these age groups that fit the definition of the DREAM Act—an executive edict, not exactly an executive order, because it

was only a memorandum between the Department of Homeland Security that they put out—and that they would follow this guideline. They created four classes of people that were defined by age and by status, but four separate classes of people created in this memorandum.

And the President manufactured a work permit out of thin air, Mr. Speaker, just simply made it up. All of the visas that exist in law, of course, are a product of Congress. And it's our exclusive authority to define immigration law. It's the President's job to enforce the laws that are on the books.

Now, the previous President had the opportunity to veto immigration law. It's all signed into law and it is the law of the land. The Constitution is the supreme law of the land. The President violated the Constitution and his own definition of congressional executive and judicial authority when he issued this executive memorandum that granted this legal status under the DREAM Act principles. That happened, I would say, June or July of last year.

Now we've come a quantum leap. As we go forward, we put together a meeting and organized the effort to take the President to court on that issue. You cannot have a President that's going to legislate by executive edict. But he did do that; and that case, Mr. Speaker, has worked its way through the courts. And I'm here to announce in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results.

The name of the case is *Crane v. Napolitano*. This references the lead plaintiff as Christopher Crane, who is the president of the ICE union, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement union. He has been a stellar individual on this. He stood boldly and strongly, and he's taken the threats and the buffeting that comes from all sides of this argument. He's testified before Congress. He has stood at a press conference and asked to be recognized to ask questions of Senators over on the Senate side. And he has flawlessly walked his way down through this thing by standing for the rule of law and for the Constitution and his own oath to uphold the law, as we have taken that oath here in this Congress to uphold the Constitution.

This decision that came down yesterday from a Federal District Court in Houston in the case of *Crane v. Napolitano*, there were 10 points that were made in this litigation, Mr. Speaker. Nine of the 10, the judge found clearly down on the side of those who support the Constitution and the rule of law and rejected the executive branch's argument that they had prosecutorial discretion to decide who to prosecute and who not to prosecute.

Time after time the judge wrote: When Congress writes in statute the word "shall," shall means shall. It doesn't mean may; it means shall. That means that when an ICE officer picks someone up and identifies them as likely to be in violation of immigration laws, they shall be placed in de-

portation proceedings. That's a "shall" that's in the law that was upheld by the Court yesterday in their decision on this multiple-page decision. So nine of the 10 components of the argument, several of which I made early on after that issuing of the executive edict last year, nine of 10 were upheld.

The 10th argument was one that the President sent it back to the executive branch and said: your argument is so illogical and baseless and convoluted and tied to footnotes, go back and rewrite your argument. But the implication or the tone of that is once that's rewritten, he's probably going to find it. I guess I don't want to put words in a judge's mouth. I'm optimistic about how that final component of the ruling will be.

In any case, it's almost a 100 percent resounding decision that says: Barack Obama and his appointees cannot write immigration law out of thin air. They can't do so by executive memorandum, they cannot do so by edict, they cannot do so by executive order. Congress writes immigration laws, Mr. Speaker, and the President's job is to take care that those laws be faithfully executed. He has not done that. He's defied his own oath of office. The Federal Court has ruled on the side of article I, legislative branch of Congress. We will see the impact of this decision.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that now it's time for the Gang of Eight to reassess as a result of this lawsuit. It's time for the open-border advocates in this Congress to reassess as a result of this lawsuit. They had concluded, the people on my side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, appear to have concluded that Republicans didn't win the elections they anticipated winning last November. On the morning after the election, some of our otherwise wise folks on our side of the aisle concluded that Mitt Romney would have been President-elect if he just hadn't said two words, "self-deport," and so now there has to be an effort to try to, let's say, start the conversation with select groups of people across the country that would require that amnesty be passed to "start the conversation."

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of those to reassess the situation and think about this. They were seeking to conform to the President's edict on his DREAM Act life. They were seeking to adjust U.S. law under the premise that the President refused to enforce existing law, and the only way that we could get law enforcement would be to conform to the President's wishes and rewrite the law and conform it to the President's political agenda.

I thought from the beginning it was a ludicrous position to take, to accept an idea that the President can, first, write a law by executive edict; and, second, Congress has to conform. Now, I've seen it happen and participated in it in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, when we have a piece of legislation and it finds its way over to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court comes down with a

ruling, and then Congress takes a look at the language of that Supreme Court's ruling, and we will bring a piece of legislation to conform with a directive from the Supreme Court. I think that's an appropriate thing for us to do, provided we agree with the Supreme Court's decision and it's clear, logical legal analysis. When we have done that, I've agreed.

An example would be the language on partial-birth abortion that banned it. The first time it went to the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court ruled that the definition of "partial-birth abortion" was too vague. So we went back and fine-tuned that language, passed it out of the Judiciary Committee, passed it out of the House and the Senate, President Bush signed it, and it was upheld when it found its way back again before the Supreme Court.

□ 1750

That's okay, and it's an appropriate and proper thing for this Congress to do—to conform our legislation to a Supreme Court decision when it's a proper one. But when the President defies the law and the policy established by the United States Congress and makes up his own as he goes along by executive edict and press conference and for Congress to accept the idea that the President of the United States directs us, either implied or literally, to conform the law to the President's wishes, I would remind all of those people who happen to think that, Mr. Speaker, that we each have our own franchise.

Our oath is to uphold the Constitution. It's not to conform to the President's whims or wishes. It's to represent the best decisions for this country and to represent the people in the districts that we represent. We owe them our best judgment and our best effort, but we don't owe anybody an obligation to conform to the President's wishes, will, or whim. That has to only conform with our best judgment, individual best judgment, collectively measured here in this Congress—House and Senate.

So I think that a Congress that would be willing to give up its legislative authority and let that power go over to the executive branch by conforming the idea of amnesty that the President has brought forward in his edict I think our Founding Fathers did not imagine. They did not imagine that this branch of government would be so willing to give up this power. Our Founding Fathers imagined that each branch of government would jealously guard the power that's granted it within the Constitution in the three separate branches of government. They expected that Congress would assert its authority in competition with and in a static tension with the President and with the courts. The courts, by the way, were designed to be the weakest of the three branches of government. That's a longer discussion.

The Gang of Eight, though, brought their bill out. What is it, Mr. Speaker? It is this:

It is amnesty first. It instantaneously legalizes everybody that's in the country illegally with a few tiny, little exceptions, and that's if we run across them randomly and if they happen to have committed a felony or three misdemeanors. Other than that, it instantaneously legalizes everybody who's here illegally whether they committed a crime of illegally crossing the border or whether they overstayed their visa or whether they committed the crime of document fraud. Those kinds of things are just simply not enforced by this administration. They are treating immigration law as if it's a secondary crime.

An example of that would be, if you've got States that say that you can't pull somebody over for not wearing their seatbelt, but if they're speeding and if it happens to be they're not wearing their seatbelt, you can write the ticket for that. That's kind of the equivalent of what's going on here.

The President essentially issued this edict that, if somebody is guilty of a felony and if they're unlawfully in the United States, then we will go ahead and deport them; but otherwise they would get similar treatment as, oh, let's say, the President's aunt, who was adjudicated for deportation and who lived in the country illegally for years after that. Finally, she surfaced again, and they granted her asylum status. If they'd sent her back to Kenya, she would have apparently been subject to kidnap and ransom, so they gave her asylum. I guess it's an undecided case with the President's Uncle Omar, who was picked up for drunken driving. He had already been adjudicated for deportation. We would know if he were anywhere other than still in the United States of America.

The law didn't apply to the President's relations, and I guess in order to conform with that, the President would like to exempt everybody from the same law that his family has been exempted from. I disagree. Congress writes the laws, and the President's job is to carry them out.

In this Gang of Eight's legislation, it's instantaneous amnesty for almost everybody, and that is breathtaking in the magnitude of it. They say 11 million. I say 11 million, 12 million, more likely 20 million. Here is what I would guarantee you, Mr. Speaker: if they move legislation out of the Senate and if it does come to the House, along the way, if any of us introduce an amendment that would cap the legalization number at their estimated number, they will never support such an amendment because they know it's a lot more than 11 million people. It's instantaneous amnesty for 11 to 20-or-more million people, but that's not good enough for them.

They also had to write into the bill that, if you have previously been deported and if you find yourself waking up in a country that you're legal to live in, we still send an invitation through this bill that you should apply

to come back into the United States because we really didn't mean it, Mr. Speaker. We didn't really mean it, the idea that people were deported for violating immigration law. If they'd like to reapply, unless they have a felony conviction or three misdemeanor convictions, they're going to give them a path to come back to the United States. So this isn't just amnesty for those who are here now. This is amnesty for those who have been sent home as well—an absolute open-door policy.

And the trade off is—what?—amnesty first for the promise of enforcement. It's the same thing that came along in 1986 and multiple times since then—amnesty for the promise of enforcement.

The promise of enforcement is that Janet Napolitano is to produce within 5 years a plan to get 90 percent operational control of the critical sectors of the border that she designates, the 90 percent of those that we see, of course, because you can't count those that you can't see. So they want to be able to catch 90 percent of those that you can see. We don't know if they're going to turn their eyes the other way, but here is what I know: we are never going to see the enforcement side of this. It's amnesty first, a promise of enforcement second. That has never worked.

If they were serious, they would go to work and secure the border, shut off the jobs magnet, restore the respect for the rule of law. We would know in this country if there were respect for the rule of law restored, and at that point, I'm ready to sit down and talk. I'm ready to have that conversation but not absent the reestablishment of the rule of law, and that means border control, serious border control. We've got the resources to do it, Mr. Speaker. It's not that we don't have it.

We're spending over \$6 million a mile on the southern border. You can build a four-lane interstate across Iowa cornfields for \$4 million a mile. You can buy the right-of-way; you can engineer it; you can design it; you can do the archeological and the environmental; you can grade it; you can put the drainage in; you can pave it; you can paint it; you can shoulder it; you can seed it; and you can put fences on it—all of that for \$4 million a mile through Iowa cornfields. You cannot convince me that we couldn't take about a third of that \$6 million a mile and in a few years build the finest, most sophisticated barrier along our southern border.

We can take some lessons from the Israelis, for example, who get a 99.9 percent efficiency rate at their border barrier. They do that because their lives depend on it. So do ours in a lot of ways, Mr. Speaker. It's not that hard to build infrastructure and add to that infrastructure the sensory devices so that we can actually get the warning signals when people do get across such a barrier. We can do all of that. We can

do it with the resources that we have. We can do it well up into the 90-some percentile of efficiency with the money that we have, and we can shut off the jobs magnet.

All we need to do is pass the New IDEA Act. IDEA, the Illegal Deduction Elimination Act. It clarifies that wages and benefits paid to illegals are not tax deductible. It lets the IRS come in. Under their normal auditing process, they would run the employees through E-Verify. When they'd run the employees through E-Verify, then we would give the employer safe harbor if they'd use E-Verify. That's a nice, comforting thing. Each employer would want to have that. If the IRS concludes that you've knowingly, willingly, or neglectfully been employing illegals, they would rule that wages and benefits paid to them are not a business expense. That means, out of your Schedule C, that money comes out and goes over into the gross receipts again and shows up in the bottom line as taxable income, and your \$10-an-hour illegal employee turns into a \$16-an-hour illegal employee, and it becomes a prudent business decision on the part of the employer to use E-Verify to clean up his workforce.

So there are two simple things, Mr. Speaker:

We can provide that border security with the resources that we have by adding infrastructure, by adding and utilizing technology in addition to—and I have not said 2,000 miles of border fence—a fence, a wall and a fence. We just build it according to the directives of the Secure Fence Act and keep building it until they stop going around the end. We shut off the jobs magnet and restore the rule of law. Then let's have a conversation, Mr. Speaker; but until then, I'm going to stand on defending the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1800

AMERICA'S DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the most important issue of our time in this country, and really the world.

We are nearly \$17 trillion in debt and \$100 trillion in debt in unfunded promises to our children and grandchildren that they stand to inherit if we fail to act. This is an issue that my colleagues and I on the Budget Committee take very seriously, and I know that most Members of this body take very seriously.

To that end, we view our role as not only legislators, but educators. And in our great State of Indiana, I talk about this issue almost in a nauseating fashion to some, but I think it's very im-

portant that we as people, as Americans, Mr. Speaker, understand what the situation really is because at the end of the day, I am very optimistic that when given the facts, the people of this country, as President Reagan observed several years ago, will right the ship, will do the right thing. We'll start to live within our means again, and they will take control of the situation.

I don't think ultimately, Mr. Speaker, that the reform that is needed to solve this problem will actually start or come from this floor or the floor of our colleagues that we have on the other side of the rotunda. The reform and the solution to this problem will come from Main Street, will come from the farm fields and the businesses and the kitchen tables of the great patriots across this land.

So it's in that vein, Mr. Speaker, that I want to make a presentation here on the floor of the House. I also make this presentation because of the current situation that we're in with regard to our budgeting process.

As I speak with you here on the floor tonight, Mr. Speaker, we have a budget that passed the House of Representatives, we have a budget that passed the United States Senate, and after 2 months of being late, as it has been nearly every year that this current President has been in office, we finally have a budget from our President.

The main difference—well, there are several differences—but the main difference I want to point out tonight between these budgets is that the budget that came out of this House is the only one that balances. Why is that important? It's important because if you never present and pass a budget that balances—and let me remind you that a balanced approach isn't a balanced budget. Someone's opinion of a balanced approach, like our President's, doesn't mean that the budget balances, no matter how many times he or House Democrats say that.

The reason it's so important that a budget balances is because it shows your intent; it shows your intent to finally start paying off the debt. Because like everyone knows, you can't possibly start paying nearly \$17 trillion in debt until you get to a balanced budget so that you have a surplus, hopefully, and then, in fact, use that surplus to pay down the debt.

So if you present and pass a budget that never balances, you intend by what you're saying and doing there to never pay off the debt. And I would submit that when you do that, you can't call it debt any more because what you're doing is stealing. You're stealing from future Americans. You're stealing from the children of tomorrow, children that don't exist yet and therefore have no voice in the matter because they can't vote. What an easy target they are.

So when you pass and you vote for budgets that never balance, that's what you're doing, you're stealing. Let's call it what it is, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I want to be clear, this isn't a partisan set of remarks because it's not a partisan issue. In fact, it's very bipartisan, and this chart here shows that.

Going from beyond Kennedy—but I just started tracking from President Kennedy on—every one of our presidents, who represented both parties since the 1960s, have accrued increasing levels of debt. Even Mr. Clinton, with the help of this Republican House who had technically balanced budgets, I think, four times in his 8 years, still overall ran up a very slight debt.

I want to be clear that our debt problems did not start on January 20, 2009, with the inauguration of President Obama. But as this chart also shows, our debt problems have been increasingly and drastically exacerbated since that time, and we need to get this under control.

Let's take a look at exactly how much we're borrowing and what's causing this debt. And I'm grateful tonight for the help of my staff member, Zach Zagar, who is on the floor with me to help get me through these slides a little bit quicker.

We are borrowing 31 cents of every dollar the Federal Government is spending. Now, I'll admit to you, Mr. Speaker, that has actually improved. When I started making this presentation about a year and a half ago, 2 years ago, we were borrowing 42 cents of every dollar we spend. But thanks to some good revenue forecasts and especially leadership right here in the House of Representatives, we've already been able to make some sensible cuts and rein in spending that has decreased some of that spending. But again, until we stop borrowing, we cannot begin to start paying down this debt: 31 cents of every dollar, Mr. Speaker.

Let's also be honest. We've been in debt before as a country, and the question then arises, why should we worry so much now. Well, we should worry now. Let me explain why we should worry by going back to the last time that this country was in this kind of debt, when our debt level, if you include the Social Security trust fund, reached nearly and over 100 percent of gross domestic product. That time was right at the end of World War II.

So what makes our situation so different now than the last time we were in so much debt? Well, number one, the cause of our debt back at the end of World War II was much different than now. The cause of our debt back then was, in fact, the war, and it was a one-time event. One way or another, even back then, we knew it was going to end. If it ended well for us, if we won, which we did, we would have a good economy coming out of that war, we would become creditor to the world and we would begin paying down that debt. In fact, that's exactly what happened. If we had lost World War II, I guess it wouldn't really matter how much debt

we had because we would all be speaking perhaps a different language. This country might not even exist.

The drivers of our debt today, however, have absolutely no intention of ending as they currently stand. I'll get to that in a little bit. The drivers of our debt today are the social entitlement programs and the interest that we continually owe ourselves and other countries.

The second difference between the last time that we had this level of debt and now is who we owe this debt to. Back then, during World War II, we owed the debt to ourselves, nearly 100 percent. Remember the war bond posters, Mr. Speaker? Remember when Americans stood up, bought those bonds and we financed World War II?

□ 1810

Increasingly, as this chart shows, our debt is owed to other countries, the largest of which right now is China. It's getting to the point where the debt we owe to other countries is nearly half our total debt. So we increasingly have creditors who, by definition, don't have our best interests at heart, not like we did as individual Americans buying those war bonds, and that's a problem. It's such a problem that it has become a national security issue, and that needs to be addressed as well.

Think about this, Mr. Speaker: with the interest that we pay China alone on the credit they issue to us by buying our Treasury bonds, et cetera, China with that interest payment every week can buy three new joint strike fighters if we let them, if those were in production. They can finance their military operations just on the money we give them. And in this increasingly complex world, changing every day, new threats, new risks, that is a particularly vulnerable place to be, and we are doing it to ourselves because of our refusal to balance budgets and otherwise live within our means, to put more on our plates now at the expense of our national security and at the expense of the children of tomorrow, people who don't exist yet and therefore have no voice in the matter.

I have to tell you, it is hard for me even as a Budget Committee member to visualize what \$17 trillion really looks like, what it means; and I certainly can't understand or visualize what I said earlier about the \$100 trillion that's on the way, specifically over the next 50 to 75 years, representing the promises that we've made under the social entitlement programs. That's what's coming. In fact, our country will be bankrupt, I'm sure, and we'll be off the world's reserve currency long before we reach the \$100 trillion, but it's coming and it's real.

So what I like to do is take actual budget numbers and break off eight zeros from them so I get them in a more manageable fashion. The President has said, I've heard him reference the Federal Government as some kind of Federal family. Well, I don't know if

I'd take it that far, but let's assume for purposes of this debt discussion that the Federal Government acted as a family. Here's what our Federal budget picture looks like.

Our annual family income, \$25,000. Those are the tax receipts, the revenue we get from the people of this country, their property that we confiscate to run the Federal Government, some of it necessary, most of it increasingly not necessary. Our annual family spending, \$36,000. That is eight zeroes lopped off, a rounded real number, leaving us an annual debt that we have to put onto one family credit card of \$11,000.

So we're a family. We're making \$25,000. We're spending \$36,000, a deficit of \$11,000. It goes on a credit card, the one family credit card that already has a balance of \$168,000. Future purchases on that credit card, the promises that we made to the wife and the kids over the years, if they were to be put on that credit card now, \$1 million.

But wait a minute. Remember I said borrowing has gone down. We're spending a little less. We have this drastic, incoherent, ham-fisted—whatever the adjectives we're hearing lately—sequester that simply cut 2 percent out of Federal spending. Gee, cutting 2 percent out of Federal spending, can you imagine what the other 98 percent of government does if all this stuff is supposed to happen on just 2 percent? Anyway, we save some money. In this example, it would come out to \$310.

Now I will give the microphone, I will yield to any gentleman or gentlewoman, Member of the House, here tonight that wants to get up here and defend this and defend these numbers. I didn't think so.

That's all right, Mr. Speaker. I will note for the record that there are very few Members here.

My next chart, this is what your Federal Government spends its money on. Now, I took the liberty of taking two pieces of the pie and pulling them out. The reason I did that was because I want everyone to understand that when we vote for budgets, the line items we vote on really only represent those two pieces of the Federal spending pie. So our votes every year when we pass a budget only concern spending, quite honestly, on those two pieces. That's non-defense discretionary and defense discretionary. That's why we call it discretionary, because we actually have discretion on dialing up defense or dialing it down, or some of the non-defense programs, like the 167 agencies or so that are under the discretionary budget. That would be the Department of Energy, Department of Education, and all of the ones in between.

But if you look at this, Mr. Speaker, most of the pie is mandatory spending, meaning it doesn't really come through the normal budget process because it can't, because these were promises that were made in the underlying law. They cannot be changed unless you change

the underlying law. I can't, as Representative ROKITA, decide how much Americans who qualify for Social Security will get in their Social Security check. The law sets that out. I don't get to decide in a budget document what services you get under Medicare. That's set in the underlying law. Medicaid, the same way.

Of course, interest is a contractual agreement. We agree to pay interest to our bondholders. That can't be changed. And then a smorgasbord of other mandatory spending rounds out what really is over two-thirds of our spending. So two-thirds of your Federal spending is on autopilot. It's not adjusted year to year. It's not as simple as just cutting or lowering budget figures. If we're going to get out of debt, in order to lower this debt, we have to reform the underlying causes of our debt, and that's our social entitlement programs.

Now, about this time, many Members are about to get up and claim 30 minutes in response on behalf of their constituents who say, Wait, I paid into those social entitlement programs. That's not the government's money; that's my money. Week after week, out of my paycheck, money went into Medicare and money went into the Social Security account, for example. I paid in; therefore, I get out.

I want to acknowledge here on the floor of the House of Representatives that that is true. You have paid in. We have paid in. We continue to pay in. But it's not the whole truth, as this chart indicates. You see on average, if you made \$71,000 a year, you and your spouse through your working lives, you will have paid in—and this is an example for Medicare—about 35 percent of what you're getting; 35 percent of what you're getting. And that 65 percent difference, quite honestly, is paid for by the children of tomorrow, almost all of it. Again, they don't have any voice in the matter because they don't exist yet.

So the moral question that we have as a country is: How much more does a future generation have to pay so we can have more on our plate now? And when you have budgets that do not balance, you are happy to say, when you vote for budgets that don't balance, you are happy to say that we're letting them pay the load. And that's different. That's the first time, this is the first time in American history as I know it, that we have basically said, We don't care. We don't care that our future generations, that the next generation, will be worse off than us at our very expense. But that's exactly what we are doing when we don't pass balanced budgets.

Like I mentioned earlier about the \$100 trillion example, it's not just the current debt load that we carry; it's what's coming. And that's what is depicted by the red line here that you notice is going nearly vertical.

□ 1820

It's on a trajectory that we may not be able to arrest, that we might not be able to bend back down again if we don't get ahold of it now.

This is what happens when 10,000 people a day retire into programs that go unreformed. And that's a problem. That's a big problem. And that's why it's so important to get ahold of this problem now, to make these reforms now, before we turn into Greece. And in our case, when that happens, it will be a lot worse, not just for us but for the entire world.

These figures do not lie. By the way, most of these figures that I present tonight don't come from TODD ROKITA's office. They come from the Budget Committee. The good Democratic members of the Budget Committee don't disagree with the numbers. I imagine there's disagreement, and we have seen disagreement certainly on the committee about how to solve the problems that the data present. I am increasingly shocked and awed to hear Members on the other side say that there really isn't a problem with the data, with the issue that the data present, but nonetheless the data is the data and the data does not lie.

There have been offered some false solutions, I would say, to our problem of this debt. I would quickly like to dispel some of them, and I'd like a point of order asking the Speaker how many more minutes I have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROKITA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The first false solution: We need more tax revenue; we're not taxing ourselves enough, and only if we tax more, especially from the, quote-unquote, rich—those who haven't paid their fair share, quote-unquote—we'd solve this debt problem.

Let me address that for a minute. This is one of the slides that doesn't come from the Budget Committee; it comes from the IRS. I have no reason to dispute it. I saw it in *The Wall Street Journal* a couple of years ago. The bars represent where the money in this country is, the taxable revenue, where people's property is, and it's divided along income groups. If you look at the far right of this chart, you'll see that the furthest right bars represent Americans who have taxable revenue of anywhere from \$1 million to \$10 million. And the largest, the highest bars, where the middle is, represent Americans who have taxable revenue of anywhere from \$75,000 to \$500,000 a year. The point of this slide is, you can take all the millionaires' money if you wanted, really make them pay their fair share, take a hundred percent of what they earn, and you'll have to assume two things: that they would continue producing, which of course they wouldn't, and you'd have to assume that they would continue living in the country, which I assume they wouldn't. Look at the mass exodus going on in

France now with a 75 percent marginal tax rate.

But let's assume for the sake of discussion that you take a hundred percent of what they earn. You're not going to get enough revenue to pay off the debt. There are not enough Oprah Winfreys—or when I'm in Lafayette I like to say Purdue football coaches—to pay off this debt. If people are saying, like our President, that more revenue is needed to pay off the debt, they're coming for the middle class. They're coming for where the property is, where the money is, and that's in people who make anywhere from \$50,000, \$75,000, to \$500,000.

The next slide reflects another false solution: let's just get rid of all that foreign aid. And I'm the first to say we've really got to examine who we give foreign aid to. I would say this, also: we don't give foreign aid necessarily to other countries so that they can thank us. We do it because there's a strategic reason to do it, like our national security, but let's assume we cut out all foreign aid. You're only addressing about 2 percent of our Federal spending. This is not something that you can solve the debt problem with.

Some say let's cut out defense. I will also be the first to say, there is tremendous waste, fraud and abuse in the military, so much that they can't even be audited, not because there's a statute preventing it; they are so big and so sloppy and so leaderless in this fashion that they cannot get themselves to an audit table, and that is wrong. We should be maximizing every dollar we can to our warfighters who protect us, and we're not doing that now.

But, Mr. Speaker, having said that, defense—if we had no defense, if we had no military—would only be a 20 percent cut in our overall spending. Not enough to balance the budget. Not enough to solve this debt problem.

We have several solutions to this, starting with the House Republican budget: reform Medicare, reform Medicaid, reform Social Security, not cut people who are in or on these programs right now because we don't have to. We have the luxury if we act now to reform these programs now, Mr. Speaker. You can go to rokita.house.gov to learn more. Only if you were born in 1958 or after are we offering a restructured program so that it's around for you, so that it's around for all Americans, future generations, and so that we don't have to hurt the people that are on them now.

I'm out of time, Mr. Speaker, to go through all those right now. I'd like to come back at some point and pick up that discussion.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COOK (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. FLORES (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending memorial services and funerals for the victims of the fertilizer plant explosion in West, Texas on April 17.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 25, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1222. A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fees for Official Inspection and Official Weighing Services Under the United States Grain Standards Act (USGSA) (RIN: 0580-AB13) received April 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1223. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AI06) received April 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1224. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General William K. Rew, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1225. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting National Guard and Reserve Equipment Report (NGRER) for Fiscal Year 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1226. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report listing all repairs and maintenance performed on any covered Navy vessel in any shipyard outside the United States or Guam during the preceding fiscal year; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1227. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Hong Kong pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1228. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mongolia pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1229. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report on discretionary appropriations legislation within seven calendar days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

1230. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Annual Charge Filing Procedures

for Natural Gas Pipelines [Docket No.: RM12-14-000; Order No. 776] received April 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1231. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Enforcement Guidance Memorandum 13-002, Enforcement Discretion Not to Cite Violations Involving the Use of the New American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Certification Marks Instead of ASME Code Symbol Stamps, While Rule-making Chances Are Being Developed received April 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1232. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of proposed lease with the Government of the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. 01-13) pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1233. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notice that the Deputy Secretary has issued the required determination to waive certain restrictions on the maintenance of a Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Office; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1234. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1235. A letter from the Executive Director, Access Board, transmitting the Board's annual report for FY 2012 prepared in accordance with Section 203(a) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1236. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting FY 2014 Congressional Budget Justification/FY 2012 Annual Performance Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1237. A letter from the Director, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, transmitting the Agency's annual report for FY 2012 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1238. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's report for fiscal year 2012 on the amount of acquisitions from entities that manufacture articles, materials, or supplies outside of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1239. A letter from the Director, Office of Self-Governance, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the Amendment No. 4 to the 2010-2014 Multi-Year Funding Agreement entered into between the Department of Interior and the Cooper River Native Association; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1240. A letter from the General Counsel, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Registry for Attorneys and Representatives [Docket No.: EOIR 138F; A.G. Order No.: 3377-2013] (RIN: 1125-

AA39) received April 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1241. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Methylone Into Schedule I [Docket No.: DEA-357] received April 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1242. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting notification that the Department has determined not to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in *R.J. Reynolds V. Food & Drug Administration*, No. 11-5332 (D.C. Cir.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1243. A letter from the General Counsel, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Forwarding of Asylum Applications to the Department of State [EOIR Docket No.: 173; AG Order No. 3375-2013] (RIN: 1125-AA65) received April 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1244. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting the Conference's Article III and bankruptcy judgeships recommendations and corresponding draft legislation for the 113th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1245. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting proposed legislation "Criminal Judicial Procedure, Administration, and Technical Amendments Act of 2013"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1246. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Green River, Small-house, KY and Black River, Jonesboro, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0041] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1247. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Patriot Challenge Kayak Race, Ashley River; Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0030] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1248. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Seafair Blue Angels Air Show Performance, Seattle, WA [Docket Number: USCG-2012-0903] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1249. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; BWRC Spring Classic, Parker, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0074] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1250. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Sabine River, near Ruliff, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-1065] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1251. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmit-

ting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; M/V XIANG YUN KOU and MODU NOBLE DISCOVERER; Resurrection Bay, Seward, AK [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0128] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1252. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; St. Patrick's Day Fireworks; Manitowoc River, Manitowoc, WI [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0116] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1253. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zones; Annual events requiring safety zones in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan zone [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0020] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1254. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Great Lakes Pilotage Rates-2013 Annual Review and Adjustment [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0409] (RIN: 1625-AB89) received April 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1255. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Charleston Race Week, Charleston Harbor; Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0081] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1256. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Beginning of Construction for Purposes of the Renewable Electricity Production Tax Credit and Energy Investment Tax Credit [Notice: 2013-29] received April 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1257. A letter from the Assistant Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Biodiesel and Alternative Fuels; Claims for 2012; Excise Tax [Notice 2013-26] received April 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1258. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Section 911(d)(4)—2012 Update received April 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1259. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting Medicare-Medicaid Coordination Office Fiscal Year 2012 Report to Congress; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1260. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting "Finalizing Medicare Rules under Section 902 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act 2003 (MMA) for Calendar Year (CY) 2012", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395hh(a) Public Law 108-173, section 902(a)(1); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1261. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting fiscal year 2014 Congressional Justification of Budget for the Office of the Inspector General; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 178. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 527) to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-47). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. McCAUL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. BASS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1692. A bill to require the development of a comprehensive strategy to end serious human rights violations in Sudan, to create incentives for governments and persons to end support of and assistance to the Government of Sudan, to reinvigorate genuinely comprehensive peace efforts in Sudan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 1693. A bill to provide an exemption for community banks from the application of Basel III capital standards; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 1694. A bill to allow the Secretary of the Treasury to rely on State examinations for certain financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BASS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 1695. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent unjust and irrational criminal punishments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 1696. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the publicly traded partnership ownership structure to energy power generation projects and transportation fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 1697. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow refunds of Federal motor fuel excise taxes on fuels used in mobile mammography vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself and Mr. BARTON):

H.R. 1698. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for 12-month continuous enrollment of individuals under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DeFAZIO (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 1699. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that genetically engineered food and foods that contains genetically engineered ingredients be labeled accordingly; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 1700. A bill to require the President to issue guidance on Federal response to a large-scale nuclear disaster; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1701. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services replacing ICD-9 with ICD-10 in implementing the HIPAA code set standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARBER (for himself and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 1702. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to transport individuals to and from facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs in connection with rehabilitation, counseling, examination, treatment, and care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 1703. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit States to reduce the amount of home equity that is exempted for purposes of determining eligibility for long-term care assistance under Medicaid and to eliminate the State Medicaid maintenance of effort requirement established under Public Law 111-148 with respect to eligibility standards to obtain Medicaid assistance for long-term care services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 1704. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for start-up expenditures for business for 2013 and 2014; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

H.R. 1705. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for certain forms of physical therapy under the TRICARE program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of Cali-

fornia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1706. A bill to establish an Independent Monitor to maintain oversight of the settlement by mortgage servicing companies that were subject to enforcement actions for unsafe and unsound practices related to residential mortgage loan servicing and foreclosure processing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ENYART, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 1707. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the "James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MORAN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HUIZenga of Michigan, Mr. MATHESSON, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 1708. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 1709. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to eligible entities to prevent or alleviate community violence by providing education, mentoring, and counseling services to children, adolescents, teachers, families, and community leaders on the principles and practice of non-violence; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 1710. A bill to authorize the Gandhiking Scholarly Exchange Initiative focusing on peace and nonviolence in global conflict resolution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1711. A bill to make funds available to the Department of Energy National Laboratories for the Federal share of cooperative research and development agreements that support maturing Laboratory technology and transferring it to the private sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 1712. A bill to prevent foreclosure of home mortgages and provide for the affordable refinancing of mortgages held by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 1713. A bill to establish a procedure to safeguard the surpluses of the Social Security and Medicare hospital insurance trust funds; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a

period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MENG, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 1714. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a grant pilot program to provide housing to elderly homeless veterans; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1715. A bill to establish procedures for the expedited consideration by Congress of the recommendations set forth in the Cuts, Consolidations, and Savings report prepared by the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1716. A bill to simplify and improve the Federal student loan program through income-contingent repayment to provide stronger protections for borrowers, encourage responsible borrowing, and save money for taxpayers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. NUNNELEE):

H.R. 1717. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a market pricing program for durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) under part B of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 1718. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, and title 39, United States Code, to provide the United States Postal Service the authority to mail wine and beer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 1719. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to save the American taxpayers money by immediately altering the metallic composition of the one-cent, five-cent, dime, and quarter dollar coins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. DESJARLAIS):

H.R. 1720. A bill to conduct a pilot program in support of efforts to increase the amount of purchases of local fresh fruits and vegetables for schools and service institutions by giving certain States the option of receiving a grant from the Secretary of Agriculture for that purpose instead of obtaining commodities under Department of Agriculture programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. Res. 179. A resolution recognizing "International Jazz Day"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 1692.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 1693.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 1694.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 1695.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1696.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 1697.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common Defense and general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. Thus, Congress has the authority not only to increase taxes, but also, to reduce taxes to promote the general welfare of the United States of America and her citizens. Additionally, Congress has the Constitutional authority to regulate commerce among the States and with Indian

Tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 1698.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 1

Article 1, section 8, clause 3

Article 1, section 8, clause 18

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1699.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1700.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1701.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution which states that Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. BARBER:

H.R. 1702.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 13

To provide and maintain a Navy.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for the carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1703.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 1704.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1705.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached bill is constitutional under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes" as well as Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1706.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 (provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States)

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes)

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:
H.R. 1707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to establish Post Offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JENKINS:
H.R. 1708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 of the United States Constitution.

Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

And

Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. LEWIS:
H.R. 1709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS:
H.R. 1710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:
H.R. 1711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:
H.R. 1712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 1713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7. No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. PETERS of California:
H.R. 1714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan:
H.R. 1715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 5, Clause 2

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. PETRI:
H.R. 1716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:
H.R. 1717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Current law has created a health care program called Medicare that is operated by the federal government. This bill would improve the efficiency and fairness of the operation of parts of that program, especially the purchase of goods and services, while affecting interstate commerce, which Congress has the power to regulate under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Ms. SPEIER:
H.R. 1718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:
H.R. 1719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—"To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures"

By Mr. WELCH:
H.R. 1720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof . . .

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 96: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 149: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 184: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 207: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 274: Ms. DEGETTE and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 292: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 324: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 362: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 363: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 376: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 377: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 411: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 419: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 474: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 498: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 508: Mr. KIND and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 519: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 520: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 543: Mr. BARBER, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 578: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 580: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 594: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 596: Mr. COOPER and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 627: Mr. COBLE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. NUNES,

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BOUTANY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 630: Mr. JOYCE, Ms. BASS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 647: Ms. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 655: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 657: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 661: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 664: Mr. GRIMM and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 684: Mr. COOPER and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 693: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 705: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 719: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 721: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 755: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN.

H.R. 783: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 792: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 807: Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 842: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 850: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 911: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 916: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 929: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 938: Mr. GARRETT and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 940: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 942: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. ENYART, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. TITUS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. McKEON, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 961: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 979: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 983: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 984: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 988: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1000: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1010: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1014: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 1020: Mr. HANNA, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 1026: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1093: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1151: Mr. MULLIN and Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 1154: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1175: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1180: Mr. OWENS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1201: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1213: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1215: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1245: Mr. VELA, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1250: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1290: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1304: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 1313: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1318: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1334: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1340: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1345: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1346: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 1417: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 1418: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 1421: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 1428: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 1432: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. REED.
 H.R. 1500: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1507: Mr. WALZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1518: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. PAYNE, and Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 1523: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1528: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
 H.R. 1578: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 1579: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 1587: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 1589: Mr. SCHRADER.
 H.R. 1590: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 1593: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr.

SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MENG, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 1595: Mr. KEATING, Ms. CHU, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H.R. 1613: Mr. RADEL and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
 H.R. 1617: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 1621: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1622: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1626: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. STIVERS, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
 H.R. 1628: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. JONES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 1638: Mr. MASSIE, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 1642: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1643: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1652: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.J. Res. 24: Mr. TIPTON.
 H.J. Res. 28: Mr. MARINO.
 H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. BARR.
 H. Con. Res. 33: Ms. SINEMA.
 H. Con. Res. 34: Ms. DELAURO.
 H. Res. 36: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. LANCE.
 H. Res. 72: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H. Res. 89: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. RADEL, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GINGREY

of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 108: Mr. SERRANO.
 H. Res. 154: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H. Res. 160: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H. Res. 173: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H. Res. 174: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. BASS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WATT, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. BARBER, Ms. HAHN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana,

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative PITTS, or a designee, to H.R. 1549, the "Helping Sick Americans Now Act," does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.